The East Tennessee Historical Society's PUBLICATIONS

No. 5 JANUARY 1933

CONTENTS

PAGE

Washington's Relations to Tennessee and Kentucky
Samuel M. Wilson 3

Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade,
1753-1775—*W. Neil Franklin* 22

Nathaniel Gist, Father of Sequoyah—
Samuel C. Williams 39

Early Explorers in the Great Smokies—
Paul M. Fink 55

The Presidential Campaign of 1828—
Isabel Thompson Kelsay 69

The Beginnings of the Railroad Movement in
East Tennessee—*S. J. Folmsbee* 81

The Downfall of the Radicals in Tennessee—
J. A. Sharp 105

The Political Background of Tennessee's War
of the Roses—*Daniel M. Robison* 125

The Camp Meeting in the Early Life and Literature
of the Mid-West—*Robert L. Shurter* 142

Writings on Tennessee History, 1931-32—
Laura E. Luttrell 150

The Executive Journal of Governor John Sevier—
Samuel C. Williams 155

Notes and News 178

List of Members 182

Price $2.00 *a copy*

EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

STUBLEY PRINTING CO. KNOXVILLE

JACKSON LIBRARY-UNCG
3 0510 0148723Y
No. 5

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY

F
442.1
E14
no.5

For Building Use Only

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/journal-east-tennessee-history_1933-01_5

The East Tennessee Historical Society's PUBLICATIONS

No. 5 JANUARY 1933

CONTENTS

PAGE

WASHINGTON'S RELATIONS TO TENNESSEE AND KENTUCKY
Samuel M. Wilson 3

VIRGINIA AND THE CHEROKEE INDIAN TRADE, 1753-1775—*W. Neil Franklin* 22

NATHANIEL GIST, FATHER OF SEQUOYAH—
Samuel C. Williams 39

EARLY EXPLORERS IN THE GREAT SMOKIES—
Paul M. Fink 55

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1828—
Isabel Thompson Kelsay 69

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE RAILROAD MOVEMENT IN EAST TENNESSEE—*S. J. Folmsbee* 81

THE DOWNFALL OF THE RADICALS IN TENNESSEE—
J. A. Sharp 105

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF TENNESSEE'S WAR OF THE ROSES—*Daniel M. Robison* 125

THE CAMP MEETING IN THE EARLY LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE MID-WEST—*Robert L. Shurter* 142

WRITINGS ON TENNESSEE HISTORY, 1931-32—
Laura E. Luttrell 150

THE EXECUTIVE JOURNAL OF GOVERNOR JOHN SEVIER—
Samuel C. Williams 155

NOTES AND NEWS 178

LIST OF MEMBERS 182

Price $2.00 a copy

EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

F
442.1
E14
no.5

MANAGING EDITOR

PHILIP M. HAMER

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY, 1932-33

MARY U. ROTHROCK, *President*
V. M. QUEENER, *Vice-President*
LAURA LUTTRELL, *Secretary*
HARVEY BROOME, *Treasurer*
W. B. HESSELTINE, *Member of the Executive Committee*
MARGUERITE B. HAMER, *Member of the Executive Committee*

COPYRIGHT, 1933, BY THE

EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society furnishes a copy of its *Publications* to each member. Correspondence concerning contributions to the *Publications* should be addressed to Philip M. Hamer, Managing Editor, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. Correspondence concerning membership and subscriptions should be addressed to Laura Luttrell, Secretary, The Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee.

The Society and the managing editor disclaim responsibility for any statements of fact or of opinion by contributors.

WASHINGTON'S RELATIONS TO TENNESSEE AND KENTUCKY*

By Samuel M. Wilson

This year of grace, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, and upon which we have just entered, will be signalized by magnificent, multitudinous, and diversified celebrations throughout the United States and the world, designed to commemorate the natal day of the greatest of Americans and to revive our knowledge and appreciation of his character, his service to mankind, and his worth as a man.

After the somewhat artificial and formal fashion of the period in which George Washington fulfilled his destiny, the portraits drawn of him in his later life and those which appeared in profusion in the years following his death, were characterized by an austerity of excessive veneration in the mind of the artist, and the true personality of "The Father of His Country" was concealed, if not distorted, by an air of remoteness.

No American was ever more perfectly endowed with native nobleness and dignity, but modesty bordering upon diffidence and a total absence of affectation were also prominent traits of his character, and nothing could have been more foreign to his wish than that, to his contemporary or future fellow-countrymen, he should be represented as a detached, unapproachable, and bloodless mortal, possessing and exhibiting the attributes of divinity. Washington in the role or posture of a demi-god is not only unnatural and unbecoming to the man, but it is precisely the posture and the role in which he, above all others, would have refused to exhibit himself. Artists and biographers of an earlier age have too often done Washington an injustice and his fellow-men a disservice; but happily, more recent views and estimates have tended to correct the false impressions created by the extravagant worship or sycophantic adulation of these over-zealous devotees.

*This address was delivered at the annual banquet of the Society at the Andrew Johnson Hotel in Knoxville, January 8, 1932.

356843

It is not the purpose of this paper to provide or to attempt to provide a new or full-length portrait of Washington which shall be true to life and which might serve to place the man in a faultless perspective; but an exposition of a single aspect of his many-sided nature and of his variform activities in the early West, which illustrate that single aspect, may not be useless in helping us to form a just and more reasonable and more satisfying notion of what this greatest of Americans was like. Hence this paper is offered as a slight contribution toward a more comprehensive and adequate treatment of the subject.

Let me begin by reminding you of the familiar bonds by which the sister states of Kentucky and Tennessee are linked to the life of Washington. During his first term as President, and on the 4th day of February, 1791, Washington signed the act of Congress by which Kentucky was granted admission to co-equal fellowship in the Federal Union. This act became effective on June 1, 1792. In his second term as President, on June 1, 1796, Washington signed the act of Congress admitting Tennessee into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States.

These were not the earliest official dealings of our first President with either of the twin states, for, in the case of Kentucky, Washington had, on the 29th of September, 1789, signed and issued on Honorable Harry Innes a commission constituting him the Judge of the United States Court for the District of Kentucky, and, in the case of Tennessee, on August 7, 1790, Honorable William Blount, one of the "Signers" of the Federal Constitution, who, as a delegate from North Carolina, had served and associated with Washington in the famous Convention of 1787, received his commission, duly signed by the President, as Governor of the "Territory of the United States South of the River Ohio". North Carolina, as you know, did not ratify and adopt the Constitution until December 22, 1789, several months after the new government had gone into operation. In the first year of the new national government, North Carolina passed an "Act for the purpose of ceding to the United States of America certain western lands therein described", and, in conformity with one of the provisions of this act, a deed to the United States, in the words of the cession act, was executed on February 25, 1790. On the 2nd of April, of the same year, the deed of cession was accepted by Congress in an act, which Washington, as President, signed, and a supplementary act of May 26, 1790, he also signed, and an ordinance for the government of the ceded territory was passed on August 7, 1790,

which he likewise signed. Doubtless other transactions of an official character were negotiated between Tennessee, both as territory and as state, and the first President of the United States, as there were other official transactions between him and Kentucky, both as district and as state, but the instances here mentioned will suffice to show how early and immediate were the contacts of Washington with both Tennessee and Kentucky during his tenure of the office of Chief Magistrate of the Republic. If he was not, in strictness, the father of these first-born political sovereignties of the early West, at least he presided as accoucheur at their births and godfather at their christening. Quite fittingly, therefore, the first celebration of Washington's birthday in Tennessee appears to have been held in Knoxville on February 22, 1793, on which occasion, we are told, the only toast drunk was: "Health and long life to the President!"

It is, of course, quite well known that the eyes of Washington, as a youth, were turned intently toward the west. Some years before he attained his majority, he entered the service of his great and good friend, Lord Thomas Fairfax, as a surveyor and, in the course of that service, explored, surveyed, and mapped considerable tracts of wild land on the eastern slopes of the Blue Ridge and across that range westward as far as the foot-hills of the Alleghenies. As successor to his brothers, Lawrence Washington and Augustine Washington, he became a co-partner in the famous Ohio Company of Virginia, which was originally projected in 1748, and, about 1763, he joined in forming another land company, the Mississippi Company of Associates. On behalf of himself and others of his comrades of the French and Indian War, he sought to make good the bounty warrants for military service, which had been pledged in 1754 by Governor Dinwiddie to the volunteers in the Virginia regiments as an inducement to enlistment, and which were confirmed by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763. Washington had not yet reached his twenty-second birthday, when, in 1753, he was despatched by the royal governor of Virginia to carry important messages to the French commandant at Fort Le Boeuf, on the upper waters of the Allegheny River, near the present Waterford, Pennsylvania. Captain Christopher Gist, who accompanied him as pilot on this dangerous mission (with Jacob Van Braam, an old Dutch friend of the Washingtons, as interpreter), had previously visited the Ohio Country as agent and scout for the Ohio Company of Virginia, and no doubt from Gist, Washington obtained his first authentic and dependable account of the region bordering the Ohio

River. His report of this mission was published in 1754, both in this country and in England. From boyhood to old age, Washington was constantly lured by the West and his interest was intelligent, sympathetic, and lasting.

Turning for a moment from consideration of the evidences of Washington's own liking for the West and his repeated projects and journeys in that direction, let us note how Tennessee and Kentucky responded to these overtures and the inveterate fondness for the "Western Waters" which they betokened.

First among all the states, Virginia, it is believed, first honored the name of Washington by applying it to that huge country which originally embraced the major portion of Southwest Virginia and lay adjacent to what was shortly afterwards known as Washington county, North Carolina, since divided into numerous counties of lesser size, within the jurisdiction of Tennessee. Washington county, Virginia, was created December 6, 1776, out of Fincastle county, at the same time that Montgomery and Kentucky counties were formed from the same imperial domain. It was the merest accident that the county which then acquired the name of Kentucky did not receive instead the name of Washington, and, if that had occurred, there can be little doubt that it would have been retained as the permanent designation of the entire region embraced within the limits of the parent county, and the state of Kentucky would today be the state of Washington, and the state by that name on the Pacific coast would have borne a different name. The state of Washington, I may here remark, owes its name to a Kentuckian. Before becoming a state of the Union, in 1889, it was organized as a territory by an act of Congress passed March 2, 1853. At that time one of the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky was Honorable Richard H. Stanton. While the act was under consideration and before its passage, it was proposed therein to call the new territory "Columbia", but, upon motion of Judge Stanton, the name Columbia was stricken out and that of Washington substituted.

Pennsylvania, Maryland and North Carolina were not far behind Old Virginia in creating new counties on their westernmost frontiers by the name of Washington.* Having lost the name in

* My friend, Judge Samuel C. Williams, the eminent jurist and historian of Johnson City, Tennessee, has pointed out that, in 1776 and previous to the creation of a Washington county by Virginia or any of the other American commonwealths, the Watauga Association, of East Tennessee, had petitioned the government of North Carolina for recognition as a constituent political appendage of the Old North State and a legal subdivision thereof under the name of "Washington District". This, it seems, was the first time the name of Washington was ever proposed as a designation for any civil or political establishment.

1776, almost by chance, Kentucky did not begin to boast a Washington county in her midst until the year 1792, but Washington county, created in that year out of Nelson county, was the very first of the new counties formed by Kentucky after it became a state. Seven years previously, however, the picturesque and historic little town of Washington was laid out in what was then a part of Bourbon (now Mason) county, Ky., and in the following year (1788) it was regularly constituted as a town by the General Assembly of Virginia.

Washington county, formed from parts of Wilkes and Burke counties, was established by North Carolina in November, 1777. Like its contemporary counties in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, the mighty and majestic county of Washington, North Carolina, of almost illimitable extent when originally created, has been dwarfed by repeated dismemberment, until it now retains but a fraction of its primitive lordly dimensions and political sway. But with Jonesboro (originally Washington Court-House) left to it as its ancient county seat and hallowed as that town and vicinity are by indissoluble association with the deeds and memory of Tennessee's beloved hero, the renowned John Sevier, Washington county, Tennessee, preserves a pre-eminence and prestige which are immortal. In 1784, the District of Morgan was divided and the counties of Washington, Sullivan, Davidson, and Greene were constituted the "District of Washington", with appropriate judicial tribunals and functionaries.

The formation and activities of the enterprising Transylvania Company, which, in March, 1775, consummated at Fort Watauga a colossal bargain or treaty with the Cherokee, injected a new and formidable factor into the beginnings of both Tennessee and Kentucky, and, therefore when the pioneer founders and foster-fathers of Kentucky set about establishing a school of learning in the backwoods of Virginia, they not unnaturally adopted the name of "Transylvania" for this infant school, not in 1780, when the institution was first launched, but three years later, in 1783, when it was reorganized and renewed efforts were put forth to set it in motion. The pioneers of education in East Tennessee were apparently more forward in their devotion to the name of Washington, however, for their first institution of collegiate grade, which owes its paternity to that capable and consecrated servant of God and man, Rev. Samuel Doak, was gratefully called "Washington College" at the date of its incorporation, on July 8, 1795, by the government of the Territory of the United States South of the River Ohio. The

long-standing controversy over the question as to whether "Father" Doak's "Washington College" or Kentucky's "Transylvania Seminary" was the very first institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains, possibly admits of contradictory solutions, depending not so much upon divergent viewpoints as upon the varying tests or criteria which may be applied to the problem. Some one has lately said, quite sapiently, that "the more esoteric geometries are logical artifices", and so it may be that our answers to the much-debated question of priority hinge, in the final analysis, upon the "logicial artifices" we employ in support of the preferred hypothesis.

If the digression may be permitted, the case, nevertheless, when fairly analyzed, it seems to me, may be stated thus: A seminary or school of elementary instruction in Kentucky was definitely provided for by the Virginia Assembly in May, 1780. This Act recited:

> "It being the interest of this Commonwealth always to promote and encourage every design which may tend to the improvement of the mind and the diffusion of useful knowledge even among its most remote citizens whose situation a barbarous neighbourhood and a savage intercourse might otherwise render unfriendly to science", there is appropriated 8,000 acres of escheated lands, within the County of Kentucky, "as a free donation from this Commonwealth for the purpose of a publick school or seminary of learning, to be erected within the said county as soon as the circumstances of the county and the state of its funds will admit."

At about the same time, it is said, Samuel Doak opened a private school of his own in the Holston settlement, at or near the confluence of the Watauga with the Holston. A private school was opened at Lexington, Kentucky, at about the same time, by John McKinney, popularly known as "Wildcat" McKinney, and instruction had been given by Joseph Doniphan at Boonesborough and Ann Poage McGinty at Harrodsburg even before this. John Filson taught in Lexington in 1782, and, in the same year, Isaac Wilson, of Philadelphia College, established the Lexington Grammar School. The "Seminary" for Kentucky, projected by Virginia in 1780, did not get under way immediately, and in May, 1783, a new act of incorporation was passed, by which the name "Transylvania Seminary" was, for the first time, affixed to the embryonic nursery of science and literature. The work of the seminary was not actually organized until November 4, 1784, when pupils were

received and grammar school instruction was regularly provided "near the dwelling" of "Father" David Rice, in Lincoln county, not far from the present city of Danville. Thence forward, with only occasional and temporary intermissions, the work of Transylvania had gone on until this day. It remained a "Seminary" from 1780 until 1798, when it was consolidated with "Kentucky Academy" and transformed into "Transylvania University". "Commencements" were held and students were graduated, but no collegiate degrees appear to have been conferred by Transylvania prior to 1799.

Rev. Samuel Doak's private school of 1780 or thereabouts was incorporated by the legislature of North Carolina in April, 1783, as Martin Academy. Two years later, i. e. in 1785, a second charter, we are told, was obtained from the legislature of the ephemeral state of Franklin. Then, after the lapse of a decade, Martin Academy became Washington College, whose proud boast it is that it was "the first school in Tennessee and the first literary institution in the Mississippi Valley". Now, a possible though somewhat tenuous distinction in favor of Transylvania may be this: that it was the first institution of higher learning west of the Alleghenies, for, although Washington College was west of a portion of the Alleghenies, it was hardly westward of the outermost ridges of that broad range of mountains. Then, too, Transylvania was some two hundred miles nearer the majestic Father of Waters, the great waterway of the mid-continent, than Washington College. Neither Washington College nor Transylvania Seminary antedated English grammar schools in Western Pennsylvania and French schools at Detroit and Saint Louis, beyond the Mississippi; and Spanish schools at New Orleans, in the Mississippi Delta, certainly flourished some years before the English schools of "Father" Doak on the Holston, of Ann Poage McGinty at Harrodsburg, of Joseph Doniphan at Boonesborough, of John McKinney, at Lexington, and of "Father" Rice, at Crow's Station or Danville, came into existence.

More vital distinction between the Transylvania Seminary foundation of May, 1783, and the Martin Academy foundation of April, 1783, are to be found in three significant facts, viz., Martin Academy was, in effect, declared a private school, whereas Transylvania Seminary was denominated a public school; no endowment was provided for Martin Academy, whereas Transylvania Seminary was substantially endowed in 1780 and this endowment was increased in 1783; Martin Academy, like its prototype, Liberty Hall Academy, in Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, was given no power to

confer degrees, whereas the collegiate status of Transylvania Seminary was explicitly set forth in the amendatory act of May, 1783. This last point may be better brought out by comparing the grant of powers in the respective charters. Thus, in the act creating Martin Academy, it is provided that its president and trustees "shall have, hold, exercise and enjoy all the powers, authorities and privileges which the president and trustees of Liberty Hall, in the county of Mecklenburg, possess and are invested with by virtue of said Act for their incorporation, passed the 9th day of May, 1777". Turning to this last-mentioned act, we find it provides that the president and trustees, or a majority of them, shall be authorized "to give Certificates to such students as shall leave the said Academy, certifying their literary Merit, and the Progress they shall have made in useful knowledge, whether it be in learned Languages, Arts or Sciences, or all of them". The language of the Transylvania Seminary charter of May, 1783, on the other hand, is much more pretentious, and unmistakably defines the "Seminary" as an institution of higher learning and of collegiate grade. Section X of the Act reads as follows:

> *And be it further enacted,* That the said trustees shall, once at their stated session in every year, and again on any convenient time, either on or before their second stated session in the same year, in the presence of as many gentlemen of liberal education as may choose to attend, cause all the students in the said seminary to be carefully examined by the professors and masters of the same, on the several branches of learning which they have respectively studied, that the fidelity of the teachers, and the diligence of their pupils may appear; and at the second stated session aforesaid, the president in open assembly shall, as has been accustomed in like cases, confer by diploma, signed by the president and any five or more of the trustees, the degrees of Batchelor or Master of Arts, upon all such students, if such there be as the said trustees, with the concurrence of a majority of the professors shall adjudge to have merited the honors of the seminary, by their virtue and erudition; and at the same time confer any honorary degrees which, with the like advice, shall be adjudged to other gentlemen on account of special merit.

The "Act for the Union of the Transylvania Seminary and Kentucky Academy", of December 22, 1798, by which Transylvania University came into being, does not in any way alter or enlarge

the collegiate powers theretofore vested in Transylvania Seminary, but simply recognizes, retains, and perpetuates those powers. It is said the first college exhibition in the western country was held on the 17th October, 1796, at Washington College, and that degrees were conferred, in that same year, upon two graduates of this institution. As yet, no evidence has been found by the writer that Transylvania Seminary ever conferred any academic degree by diploma regularly granted prior to 1799. Potentially, therefore, Transylvania preceded Washington College, but in practice the Tennessee institution holds the lead.

For myself, however, the question of primacy in point of time possesses but slight interest. I am far more interested in the kindred forces which, operating at practically the same period and under like conditions in the life of the several frontiers, produced contemporaneously, if not simultaneously, substantially the same results. There is glory enough for all concerned, and I may be permitted to say that the friends and admirers of Old Transylvania rejoice in the glow of the golden morning and the splendor of the brilliant noon-tide which have shone upon the pathway of Washington College from its genesis to its full-orbed maturity. Not in a spirit of unseemly rivalry or ill-natured contention, but in the spirit of true magnanimity, we wish to see these two noble institutions maintain their splendid traditions and expand their usefulness, while exchanging mutual felicitations and forever cherishing mutual good will. Amity and reciprocal concessions may not positively settle ancient controversies or banish rivalry, but they will moderate debate, compose differences and lead to united and harmonious and beneficent service in the cause of education and universal enlightenment.

The limits of the hour will not permit extended reference to Washington's intimate connection with Indian affairs as related to Tennessee, and more especially to the Cherokee and Chickasaw of Tennessee. Nor is it necessary, for the purposes of this address, to enumerate the occasions on which the advice or intervention of Washington was sought by those arch-patriots among the pioneers of the "Western Waters", who looked with disfavor on the intrigues which went on both in Tennessee and Kentucky in the interest of Spain or France or, finally, of Great Britain. The story of the so-called "Spanish Conspiracy", as it affected Kentucky and Tennessee, has been rehearsed at full length by various writers, and the "French Enterprise", engineered by Citizen Genet, has likewise received due attention at the hands of historians both of Tennessee and Kentucky. With respect to the Genet episode, Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey, the gifted

chronicler and interpreter of Tennessee's earliest annals, has displayed his insight and candor by remarking that "the intrigue of M. Genet was successful in unveiling, rather than in producing, a spirit of serious disaffection on the part of the people of the West with the Federal Administration". Washington was not only keenly interested in all that went on in relation to these abortive movements of a restless and unruly element, but through his personal and official contacts with friends in Kentucky and Tennessee, he kept himself constantly advised concerning them, and yet he preserved his wonted balance and clear-headed sense of proportion, and frankly sympathized with, even where he could not approve, the grievances and complaints of the restive borderers. Of the soldiers who had served with Washington, on the Braddock campaign or under him in the Continental Army, many veterans, both officers and privates, settled in Kentucky and Tennessee after the close of the Revolution.

The intervention of the General Government to allay the hostility and arrest the periodical incursions of the Indian tribes north of the Ohio into the Kentucky and Tennessee country, the organization of boards of war and the embodying of troops for the protection of the two states, the efforts to pacify the Southern tribes and the negotiation of treaties with the Choctaw, Creeks, Chickasaw, and Cherokee, which went on with slight interruption between 1789 and 1795, all took place during the administration of Washington as President, and these and other relevant activities, both civil and military, excited the personal solicitude and received the constant watchcare of this faithful guardian of American rights and liberties. The successive expeditions of Generals Harmer, Scott, Wilkinson, St. Clair, and Wayne, all originated directly or indirectly with the War Department of the United States, and Washington, as Commander-in-Chief, was responsible for the orders that brought these campaigns of retaliation and conquest into being. The winning of the Battle of the Fallen Timber, (otherwise known as the Battle of the Rapids of the Maumee or Miami of the Lakes,) by "Mad" Anthony Wayne, on August 20, 1794, virtually ended the perennial Indian menace and the Treaty of Fort Greeneville, consummated on August 3, 1795, released the harassed settlers of Tennessee and Kentucky from further serious molestation by the red-skinned savages of the Northwest.

After his retirement from the Presidency and when once again he was free to enjoy the repose of Mount Vernon and to turn his thoughts unreservedly to his own private affairs, we find Washing-

ton renewing his connection with the western country. Even before he had left the Presidency, traces of his reviving interest are discoverable. Thus, under date of January 17, 1795, Washington wrote from Philadelphia to one Charles Morgan, then a resident of Washington County, Pennsylvania, as follows:

> Your letter of the 26th of November came safe (but not expeditiously) to hand.
>
> I hope Colo. Cannon has, long ere this, surrendered to you, *all* the papers respecting my business, which are in his possession; togethed with a full and complete statement of what is due to me either from the tenants, or from himself, up to the period of your taking the management of it yourself, and that you will be able without further procrastination or difficulty, to collect the amount of what may be found due to me from both.
>
> As I am more inclined to sell than to rent the lands I hold on the Western waters, and giving leases, although for a short term, may be a hindrance to the former. I would have you rent from year to year *only*.—I have no doubt of obtaining what I ask for the tract in Washington Cty. (County), (giving credit)—viz—four dollars an acre; the number of full-handed emigrants that are pouring into this country from all quarters owing to the disturbed state of Europe—and the quantity of money brought by them, and sent over by others, to be vested in lands have given an astonishing start to the price of this article. If therefore I do not sell soon on the terms I have just mentioned I shall raise my price.
>
> If I do not sell my lands on the Ohio & Great Kanhawa in a lump—or at least by whole tracts, they will not be sold *at all, by me*.—These will fetch me fifty pr. Ct. more at this time than I could have sold them for two years ago.

Charles Morgan, to whom the above letter was written, was probably a son or near relative of General Daniel Morgan, under whom he served as a soldier during the Revolution. He also served under General George Rogers Clark on the Illinois and Wabash campaigns. With his brother, John Morgan, who seems to have been killed by the Indians prior to the year 1780, Charles Morgan came to Kentucky with Captain Hancock Lee, the surveyor for the Ohio Company of Virginia, in May-June, 1775. As heir-at-law

of his brother John, Charles Morgan applied for and was granted, on January 28, 1780, by the Virginia Land Commissioners, a certificate for a pre-emption of 1,000 acres of land in the District of Kentucky "on account of marking & improving the same in the year, 1776, lying on the most easterly branch of Stoner's Fork of Licking Creek (River), near the head thereof, including a Spring known by the name of John Morgan's Spring & a Cabin". Charles Morgan came to Kentucky, after the close of the Revolution, it seems, and settled in Clark county, purchasing a large body of land on the Kentucky River, at the mouth of Howard's Lower Creek. His experience qualified him for the duties of a land agent, and doubtless he was recommended to Washington for this appointment by General Morgan. Charles Morgan was one of the party who accompanied Washington from Fort Pitt (Pittsburgh) on his voyage down the Ohio, in October, 1770. Under date of October 20, 1770, Washington notes that "We embarked in a large Canoe with sufficient store of provisions and necessaries and the following persons (besides Dr. Craik and myself) to-wit: Captain (William) Crawford, Joseph Nicholson, Robert Bell, William Harrison, *Charles Morgan,* Daniel Reardon, a boy of Captain Crawford's, and the Indians who were in a canoe by themselves". Writing to Presley Neville, of Pittsburgh, from Philadelphia, on June 16, 1794, relative to his lands in Pennsylvania, particularly those on Miller's Run of Chartier Creek, Washington said:

> Inclosed is a blank power, authorizing Mr. Charles Morgan, or any other with whose name you shall fill it, to collect the rents arising from my land in Fayette and Washington counties in this State, together with such arrearages as may be due for the preceeding years, if any there be. Another blank is also left, which I pray you to fill up with the percentage to be allowed as a compensation for the trouble and expense of collection. The inducements to this are, first, because I do not recollect what Colonel Cannon (i. e. Col. John Cannon, the founder of Cannonsburg, Pa.,) has been allowed for his services; and, secondly, because there is no invariable allowance established, places and circumstances varying it.

In this letter to Presley Neville, Washington gives vent to a sense of disillusionment with respect to his land ventures in the West, saying: "From the experience of many years, I have found distant property in land more pregnant of perplexities than profit". It became necessary later to resort to litigation to oust stubborn

squatters from these Miller's Run lands. Washington made a visit in person to these lands in September, 1784. On June 1 1796, he sold the entire tract, containing by survey 2, 813 acres, to his local agent, Matthew Richie. At that time it appears it was already subdivided into thirteen farms.

Although, in his letter to Morgan, of January 17, 1795, Washington manifested no disposition to acquire any more lands in the Ohio Valley, we know from indisputable records that this is precisely what he did in the closing years of his life. The land-hunger, with which Americans everywhere were possessed, remained a ruling passion with Washington even unto death. In fact, but a little more than a year before his death, Washington concluded a purchase from General Henry ("Light-Horse Harry") Lee, of "Stratford", Westmoreland county, Virginia, by a deed bearing date November 5, 1798, of two tracts of land in Kentucky, one of 3,000 acres and the other of 2,000 acres. The original contract for these lands was made on December 9, 1788, some ten years before the final consummation of the trade. These lands were valued by General Lee at 500 pounds or 600 pounds, and Washington gave in exchange for them a valuable thoroughbred stallion, called "Magnolia", which General Lee immediately shipped to South Carolina. The lands were located on Rough Creek, a tributary of Green River, and were thought to be valuable for the iron ore which they contained, but the deposits subsequently proved to be disappointing.

Filson's "Map of Kentucke" of 1784, which had been dedicated by the cartographer to "His Excellency George Washington, late Commander in Chief" of the Continental Army, and with which Washington was no doubt quite familiar, bore witness to the presence of an "Abundance of Iron Ore" in the locality drained by the waters of Rough Creek. But with his usual prudence, Washington was not disposed to proceed headlong with his bargain, and in 1797, through a personal examination of the lands by General Alexander Spotswood, he sought to acquire explicit information as to their situation and value. From Spotswood's report, Washington seems to have been impressed with "the general good quality of the land" and the fact, (as he himself records it,) that "there is a valuable Bank of Iron Ore thereon", and the schedule attached to his will, in which these comments occur, also mentions the important fact that Rough Creek, "a branch of Green River affords ample water for Furnaces and forges". As a matter of fact, from a very early day, iron has been more or less successfully mined and smelted in

that section of Kentucky which embraces the Washington lands in Grayson county, but there is no evidence as yet discovered to show that any ore, of merchantable quantity or quality, was ever extracted from the deposits of the mineral on these particular lands. They are now and have always been used mainly, if not exclusively, for agricultural purposes, and no town of any size or consequence has ever been built within their boundaries. Washington still owned them at his death, and they passed under provisions of his last will.

In the month of June, 1795, while the Federal Government was still located in Philadelphia, Rev. James Blythe, as agent for the "Kentucky Academy", solicited and obtained a donation for the infant institution of $100.00 in cash from President Washington, as did from Vice-President John Adams and several other dignitaries of the national government, and a number of prominent private citizens. The original parchment subscription list, bearing the faded and now undecipherable autograph of President Washington, is still preserved among the archives of Transylvania University at Lexington. It is recorded that the President received Dr. Blythe with great courtesy and expressed his warm interest in the cause of popular education. By Doctor Blythe's report, he collected as the result of his canvass for funds in the East, in the summer of 1795, a total of $2,000 in cash and about an equal amount in value of books.

As is well known, General Washington refused to accept any pecuniary or other emoluments for his services in the War of the Revolution, and, while many other officers and privates were granted bounty lands for such services, Washington resolutely abstained from profiting by any such gratuity. To his nephew, Lieutenant George Washington, however, a warrant, No. 135, was issued by the Commonwealth of Virginia, on February 20, 1783, for 2,666 & 2-3 acres, "in consideration of his services for three years as a Lieutenant in the Virginia Line". The full name of this young soldier was George Augustine Washington. He managed the Mount Vernon estate for Washington during the latter's second term as President. His record may be found in Saffell's *Records of the Revolutionary War,* in Eckenrode's *List of Revolutionary Soldiers of Virginia,* and in Heitman's *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army, During the War of the Revolution.* He died in February, 1793, and, in the division of General Washington's lands on the Great Kanawha River, the heirs of Lieutenant George A. Washington, who are expressly mentioned in Washing-

ton's will, were allotted lot No. 12, containing 1,180 acres. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that when the patent for Washington's lands on the Great Kanawha, embracing 10,999 acres, was issued to him, on December 15, 1772, they lay in what was then Fincastle county, Virginia, (created out of Botetourt in February, 1772, to commence December 1, 1772,) which wide-spreading county, at the time, also included all of Kentucky. Other members of the Washington family also became interested at an early day in Kentucky lands.

In the Public Library, at Lexington, Kentucky, hangs a large oil painting, representing the Washington family group at Mount Vernon. This beautiful canvas is by the artist, Henry Inman, who copied it from the original well-known painting by Edward Savage. The Savage painting, now belonging to Mr. Thomas B. Clarke, was exhibited, in 1929, in the collection of famous portraits gathered by the Virginia Historical Society at "Virginia House", the home of Mr. Alexander W. Weddell, in Richmond, Virginia. The reproduction by Inman is owned by Mr. George B. Clay, of Lexington, Kentucky, who is a grandson of the Honorable Henry Clay, and it has an interesting history. This is revealed in a letter, written by the donor, Mr. James C. Johnston, a North Carolinian, to Henry Clay in 1844, and which reads as follows:

Edenton, N. Ca., 24 July, 1844,

My dear Sir:

I have employed Mr. Inman, an American artist of New York, to make a painting of the Washington Family, which I have not seen, but am informed is finished in a handsome style. It accompanys this letter.

May I beg the favor of you to present it with my best respects to Mrs. Clay as a mark of the high esteem I have for her character, particularly as the Patroness of Domestic Industry, while you are its great Patron.

I present this painting to her because I think there is a great similarity in her character to that of Mrs. Washington, who remained at Mount Vernon and attended to General Washington's domestic affairs while he was fighting to establish the Independence of our Country. So Mrs. Clay has devoted herself to your concerns at 'Ashland' while you have been fighting with the greatest mental energy to *preserve that independence*. But for Washington we might still have been colonies of Great Britain,

> and but for you we should certainly have been her tributaries—and while, Sir, I esteem you more worthy to fill the seat of that great man as President than any successor he has had, so I know no one more worthy the place of Mrs. Washington than Mrs. Clay.
>
> If she shall think the Painting worthy a place at 'Ashland', I shall be truly gratified and highly honored by its acceptance.

Here it may not be amiss to remind you that Lucretia Hart Clay, the wife of Henry Clay, was a daughter of Colonel Thomas Hart and his wife, Susanna Gray, daughter of Colonel John Gray, of North Carolina. Barbara Gray, the mother of Governor William Blount, was of the same family, and Governor Blount and Mrs. Clay were in consequence near cousins. In honor of Governor Blount, then governor of the Territory of the United States South of the River of Ohio, which later became the state of Tennessee, Blount College, chartered by the territorial legislature on September 10, 1794, was so named. It was, as you well know, the forerunner of the present University of Tennessee. Greeneville and Blount colleges, both chartered in 1794, antedated Washington College as colleges, but not as literary institutions. The "Kentucky Academy", by the way, which in 1798 was merged with "Transylvania Seminary", was chartered on December 12, 1794. The Blount Papers will, doubtless, furnish many proofs of the intimate official relations and frequent correspondence between President Washington and Governor Blount during the period when Tennessee occupied a territorial status. Many such indirect contacts are revealed in the manuscripts of Colonel David Henley, in the Calvin Morgan McClung Collection of the Lawson McGhee Library, here in Knoxville.

I can cite but two examples to illustrate what I mean by "indirect contacts". At my request, the secretary of the East Tennessee Historical Society has kindly brought to this meeting a contemporary printed copy of the Holston Treaty of July 2, 1791, concluded by Governor William Blount with the Cherokee Nation of Indians, together with Washington's proclamation of November 11, 1791, announcing the ratification of the treaty. Writing to General Henry Knox, Secretary of War, on August 5, 1792, Washington, with that rare wisdom he always displayed, said:

> I wish Governor Blount may have been able to terminate the conference which he was to have had at Nashville about the 25th of last month with the Cherokees, Chickasaws and Choctaws, to the mutual advantage and satisfac-

> tion of all the parties concerned; but the difficulty of deciding between lawless settlers and greedy land speculators on one side, and the jealousy of the Indian nations and their banditti on the other, becomes more and more obvious every day; and these, from the interference of the Spaniards, if the reports we have be true, and other causes, which are too evident to require specification, add not a little to our embarrassments.

A tribute to Washington, even more personal and impressive than the naming of Washington College in his honor, was paid him by Tennessee's redoubtable "Nolichucky Jack". In token of his admiration for the great soldier who was "first in war" as he was "first in peace", General John Sevier, to demonstrate that he was, more than all else, "first in the hearts of his countrymen", named his first son by his second marriage to "Bonny Kate" Sherrill, George Washington Sevier. This son, born on February 1, 1782, before the last guns of the Revolutionary conflict had ceased reverberating, called his first-born child and eldest son, George Washington Sevier. And, not to be outdone in loyalty to "Harry of the West" by the distinguished North Carolinian who had compared Clay to Washington, George Washington Sevier, the elder, named his eleventh child and youngest son, Henry Clay Sevier, in honor of Kentucky's favorite son.

From first to last, Washington was the land surveyor, *par excellence*. An illustration of this will be found in a letter he wrote to James Overton, in September, 1796, with respect to his appointment as surveyor general of the Northwest Territory. James Overton was a member of that family of Overtons, which has been notably prominent in both Tennessee and Kentucky from the earliest times. This letter, the original or duplicate of which is now owned by a resident of Lexington, Kentucky, reads as follows:

Philadelphia 12th Septr., 1796.

Dear Sir:

> By a recurrence to the Acts of the last Session of Congress, you will find one for disposing of the ungranted lands No. Wt. of the Ohio;—and for appointing a Surveyor General for the purposes therein mentioned;—and you may have heard, that Mr. De Witt who was Geographer to the Army at the close of the War, after the decease of Mr. Erskine, and at present the Surveyor General of the State of New York, (a man of profound knowledge

in mathematics, and sufficiently skilled in astronomy,) was nominated to that office, and has declined the acceptance of it.

It is yet vacant;—and you have been mentioned to me as a Gentleman to whom it might be acceptable.

Without taking then a circuitous rout to ascertain this fact, I shall apply immediately to yourself, for information;—and will frankly ask, because I am sure you will candidly answer (if the appointment should meet your wishes) whether your knowledge in mathematics, practical surveying, and so much of astronomy as is useful to a skilful exercise of the latter, for discovering the Latitude, Meridian, &c., now are, or easily could be made familiar to you.—These questions are propounded because affirmative qualifications are essential.

As the season & circumstances begin now to press for an appointment and as my continuance here, and the road I shall travel back to Virginia (for the purpose of returning with my family for the winter) are somewhat uncertain, I request the favor of you to put your answer to this letter under cover to the Secretary of State, who will be directed to open it and to fill up the blank Commission which I shall deposit in his office with your name, if you are disposed to accept it;—or with that of another Gentleman who is held in contemplation, if you do not.—You may if it is not too troublesome, address a duplicate to me at Mount Vernon, to remain in the Post Office at Alexandria, until called for.

Many of Washington's collateral relatives have lived in Kentucky; some are living there now. Honorable George Washington, a member of this family, was a delegate from the county of Campbell to the last constitutional convention of Kentucky, held in 1890-91, and was temporary chairman of that Convention. Heirlooms and keepsakes associated with the life and person of Washington are still religiously preserved in the families of his Kentucky kindred. No doubt the same may be said of many Tennesseans.

The present survey of Washington's contacts with Tennessee and Kentucky of necessity leaves much to be supplied. Important and illuminating incidents, as yet unknown to the writer or unmentioned herein, will doubtless be recalled by the reader, and

others of equal significance will be developed by research. If this imperfect exposition of the subject should lead to a more exhaustive, circumstantial, and satisfying narration of all the verifiable facts which attest the close relations of General Washington with the two states immediately concerned, the result cannot be other than most instructive and gratifying. Tennessee and Kentucky, as was happily observed by one of Washington's successors, Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, while possessing distinctive characteristics peculiarly their own, are more nearly alike than either is like any of the other states of the American Union; and it is not strange to find that Washington himself looked upon these pioneer commonwealths as virtually twin-born.

Brining my paper to a close, let me venture the remark that, if in this year of the Washington Bi-Centennial, with its world-wide commemorations, a benediction could be pronounced upon the United States of America by their first President, I incline to think the words he might utter would take form somewhat like Charles Hanson Towne's "Prayer for the Old Courage":

> Brave soldiers of the spirit, guard ye well
> Mountain and fort and massive citadel:
> But keep ye white forever—keep ye whole
> The battlements of dream within the soul!

VIRGINIA AND THE CHEROKEE INDIAN TRADE, 1753-1775*

By W. Neil Franklin

When young George Washington and his Virginia militia exchanged shots with French soldiers in the Ohio Valley in the spring of 1754 they precipitated the American phase of the Seven Years War. In the face of an enemy with superior forces the Virginians retreated, leaving France, for the time at least, in control of all the disputed transmontane territory. Hoping, perhaps, that they might be made use of by Washington, or if too late for that, that they might be sent against any Indians allied with the French, Cherokee warriors were requested by Governor Robert Dinwiddie in exchange for war materials and other supplies. In July, 1754, Abraham Smith was sent by the governor to the Cherokee to fetch the desired warriors, but the chieftain, Old Hop, complained that no supplies had as yet been sent, and that until such appeared no fighting men need be expected.[1] This answer Old Hop requested the Virginia trader, Richard Paris (or Pearis), to carry back to Dinwiddie, but that Paris did so seems hardly likely, for that same month he wrote the governor in his own behalf, requesting permission to take over the Long Island, or great Island, of the Holston,[2] where he planned to erect a trading post, probably in company with Nathaniel Gist. Dinwiddie replied that Paris could acquire the Long Island by going through the proper legal forms,[3] and expressed the wish that Virginia might supply the Cherokee, but he went on to state that he knew little of such matters. Nevertheless, that same month the governor wrote that he had ordered powder and lead sent to the Cherokee,[4]

*This is a continuation of "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1673-1752", in East Tenn. Hist. Soc., *Publications,* No. 4 (Knoxville, 1932), 3-21. It was read at a meeting of the Society at Knoxville, Nov. 4, 1932.

[1] South Carolina Indian Affairs, V, 14-20.

[2] Near the present Kingsport, Tennessee.

[3] R. A. Brock (ed.), *The Official Records of Robert Dinwiddie, Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Virginia,* 1751-1758 (Richmond, 1883), I, 266-268. In his letter dated August 2, 1754, the governor remarked that he agreed with Paris "that carrying liquor to the Indians is prejudicial to them and hurtful to trade", yet a Carolina trader reported that upon Paris' next trip to the Cherokee he carried into the nation twenty kegs of rye whiskey (S. C. I. A., V, 41-47).

[4] *Dinwiddie Letters,* I, 271.

but it is doubtful that any was actually received by the red men of the mountains.

In February, 1755, General Edward Braddock brought to America some fifteen hundred British redcoats to be used in conjunction with the colonials in driving the French from the Ohio Valley. Within a few weeks Governor Dinwiddie had sent into the Cherokee country Nathaniel Gist, who was to obtain as many warriors as possible, these to be amply furnished with war materials by Virginia. The governor's instructions had said nothing about "a great and Constant Trade", but knowing the Indian nature and needs far better than did Dinwiddie, Gist promised this on his own responsibility.[5] At first the Cherokee were visibly impressed, but soon their ardor cooled; after all, had not Virginia often promised them a trade in times past? and had very much ever come of these promises? Then the Carolina traders, some of whom had returned to their old haunts, may have plainly told the Indians that the governor's letter had in reality said nothing at all of a trade. Moreover, the Cherokee had learned from the northern Indians that the latter planned to remain neutral until they could foresee the outcome of the Anglo-French conflict. And so it was that Gist returned to Virginia emptyhanded.[6] The moral seemed plain: if Dinwiddie really desired Cherokee assistance, he must begin a regular trade with the red mountaineers, and that soon.

With the approach of summer, 1755, General Braddock began his campaign, his immediate objective being the French fort, Duquesne, at the forks of the Ohio River.[7] Moving into a wild country, most likely infested with the enemy, there was exceeding need for caution, and as scouts Cherokee warriors would have served well, and in the event of a general engagement the Cherokee were well acquainted with the principles of wilderness warfare. But Dinwiddie had not sent goods, and the Cherokee did not send warriors. The Cherokee might, or might not, have been able to save Braddock from disaster, but disaster he did suffer when on the ninth of July, almost within sight of his objective, his army was almost wiped out by a joint attack of the French and their Indian allies. The governor of Virginia was probably stunned by the news, but immediately thereafter came the clamors of frontier folk for protection against roving bands of French Indians turned loose against the western settlers.

[5] S. C. I. A., V, 41-47. A Carolina trader sent the above information to Governor Glen in a letter dated March 27, 1755. The messenger's name was spelled "Guest", but it must have been Nathaniel Gist.

[6] *Ibid.*, V, 53-59.

[7] Fort Duquesne was located where Pittsburgh now stands.

Again there was need of assistance, and again Dinwiddie turned to the Cherokee. His agent was the trusted Richard Paris, who now had to overcome not only the depressing effect of Braddock's defeat, but also the machinations of the Carolina traders, who left with the Indians the impression that his purpose in coming among them was not to bear any message from Virginia but to collect from them an obligation of some 2500 pounds of deer skins. Paris rose to the occasion; in a public bonfire he burned his ledgers and cancelled the debts. What other means, if any were necessary, the trader used to gain his object does not appear, but when Richard Paris left the nation in September, 1755, he was at the head of four score Cherokee warriors, all pledged to take part in the forthcoming campaign of Major Andrew Lewis against the Francophile Shawnee.[8]

When the new year, 1756, dawned, there was still great need of native assistance, yet Virginia had begun no regular trade with the Cherokee. The only form of traffic was the irregular expeditions of individual traders. By this time there were those who feared that the red mountaineers might be won to the enemy cause by French emissaries, and then Virginia's plight would be sad indeed. To prevent such an outcome a plan was brought forward for the construction, at some point along the Holston, of a combination fort and factory.[9] Then, while this plan was being discussed in the colony, Virginia dispatched delegates to Broad River, North Carolina, there to exert every effort to induce the Cherokee commissioners to consent to a binding military alliance with the Old Dominion. Among those present at the conference was the aged emperor, Attakullakulla, who now reminded the Virginians of his former attempts to encourage a trade between the two peoples and reiterated the desire of his people for the inauguration of a regular commerce that he hoped would prove of "mutual advantage".[10] Strangely enough, however, the treaty which was drawn up, that of March, 1756,[11] omitted all reference to such a trade, although Attakullakulla may have expected the development of such intercourse if the Virginians remained true to their promise of building a fort deep in the Cherokee country, in return for which the nation was to furnish Virginia with four hundred warriors.

The war with the French was now in full swing; the frontiers were reeling under the repeated assaults of the French Indians;

[8] *Va. Burgesses, Journals,* 1752-1758, pp. 379-381. Paris was later reimbursed by the Virginia assembly for his cancellation of the Cherokee debt.

[9] *Va. Mag.,* XIX (1911), 302-304. The above information was derived from a letter written by a Virginia clergyman, dated February 10, 1756.

[10] *Ibid.,* XIII (1905-1906), 253-254.

[11] *Ibid.,* XIII (1905-1906), 257-262.

expediency demanded that Virginia keep faith with the Cherokee. And so it was that the promised fort was built in the summer of 1756, built upon the northern bank of the Little Tennessee River, near the Cherokee village of Chota, and some twenty-five miles southwest of the present city of Knoxville.[12] The Indians naturally expected Virginia to garrison the fort, but Governor Dinwiddie delayed doing so, fearing that the Cherokee had already determined to ally with France. [13] Just a few months after the Old Dominion had completed its stronghold in the Overhill Cherokee country the South Carolinians, feeling rather bitterly toward Virginia for the latter's apparent aspirations toward primacy in Indian affairs,[14] constructed and garrisoned Fort Loudoun, located approximately at the junction of the Tellico and Little Tennessee rivers, and only a few miles from the Virginia fort.[15] It was probably the building of Fort Loudoun that swung the Cherokee definitely to the English side and sent their war parties scouring the Ohio country in search of the French-favoring Shawnee.[16] And to assure the mountain Indians of the unwavering support of their English allies there could, perhaps, be nothing more efficacious than the establishment of an orderly, abundant trade.

Although in August, 1756, the governor of Virginia had stated that he stood ready to encourage intercourse with the Cherokee,[17] several months passed before the colony took official action. Then, in the late spring of 1757, the assembly appointed five men to serve as "The Trustees of the Indian Factory of Virginia" and appropriated the sum of five thousand pounds for use in "establishing a trade with the Indians in alliance with his majesty." The trustees should permit no liquor to be carried into the Indian country, and they should choose as factors men willing to be bonded that they would engage in no private trade.[18] Virginia's object was not financial gain, for the goods were to be disposed of at cost and the furs and skins received therefor should be exchanged for other goods which in turn would be sold to the Indians without profit.[19]

---

[12] *N. C. Hist. Rev.,* II (1925), 309.

[13] Archibald Henderson, *The Conquest of the Old Southwest* (New York, 1920), 67-68.

[14] South Carolina Public Records, XXVI, 84-105. Transcripts of part of this series are in the McClung Collection, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee.

[15] *N. C. Hist. Rev.,* II (1925), 315-322.

[16] The Cherokee, however, would not send the four hundred warriors to Virginia, because of the disconcerting influence of the Carolina traders (*Dinwiddie Letters,* II, 555-556) and of the colony's failure to garrison the Virginia fort.

[17] *Dinwiddie Letters,* II, 487.

[18] Hening, *Statutes,* VII, 116-118.

[19] *Dinwiddie Letters,* II, 640.

The trustees, finding few wares in the colony suitable for trading purposes, ordered a great quantity of supplies from England.[20] The Cherokee grew impatient, but Dinwiddie bade them wait until the goods should come by ship, promising them that a caravan would be sent into their country in the spring of 1758, at which time the Virginia fort would also be garrisoned.[21] Spring came, but it brought the Cherokee neither garrison nor goods from Virginia; just another instance, the red men must have reasoned, in which the Chesapeake colony had made them smooth promises which, in the end, had proved meaningless. Virginia apparently attempted no excuses, offered no apologies; relations, long tense, became even more so. Carolina settlers had, for some time, been encroaching upon hunting lands claimed by the mountain Indians; the trade from Carolina had been severely curtailed; several warriors were killed as a result of a difference of opinion as to red or white ownership of certain horses along the Virginia frontier; and then, somewhat later, other tribesmen, accused of deserting the Forbes expedition against Fort Duquesne, were accorded humiliating treatment.[22] Young and thoughtless Cherokee warriors sought to embroil their nation in war with the English, but even yet some there were who clung desperately to the hope of a trade with Virginia, a trade which might dispel the grim spectre of war. In January, 1759, the emperor himself came again to Williamsburg to make the now familiar plea to the colony's new executive, Francis Fauquier. The latter believed that all differences were adjusted, and promised to begin the trade the coming spring.[23] But the blood-thirsty warriors did not regard all differences as adjusted; at last it was indeed too late to begin the trade, for war with the Cherokee was a reality.

"The Trustees of the Indian Factory of Virginia" had failed to prevent war with the Indian "allies"; their *raison d'etre* was no more. A caravan of supplies, far on the way to Cherokee-land, had to be recalled, and early in 1760 the trustees were ordered to sell the goods accumulated for trading purposes, and to balance all accounts with the treasurer of the colony.[24] When the scheme for a public trade came to an untimely end, all legal intercourse with the warring Indians ceased. If the Cherokee could be prevented from obtaining war materials from without, then the conflict could

[20] *Ibid.*, II, 657.
[21] *Ibid.*, II, 700. It was probably intended that the Virginia fort should serve as a trading factory.
[22] For the causes of the Cherokee War, consult *N. C. Hist. Rev.*, II (1925), 442-458.
[23] *Va. Burgesses, Journals*, 1758-1761, p. 267.
[24] Hening, *Statutes*, VII, 354-355.

be brought to a more immediate conclusion. Fortunately, the French had suffered a series of recent reverses and were unable to send supplies to the Cherokee, although some English traders, spurred on by hope of wartime profit, did engage in an illicit traffic, which, however, must have been inconsiderable.[25] Military expeditions penetrated far into the enemy country, laying waste the fields and villages. In the beginning the Indians had regarded the white man's wares as luxuries, but after two or three generations of contact with them some commodities had come to be virtual necessities, and it was the hope of supplies, in part at least, that inspired the Cherokee to sue for peace after many months of wasteful warfare.[26] The prospect of peace appeared welcome to the Virginians, also, and their participation in the war came to an end when a treaty of peace was signed in November, 1761 at Fort Robinson. The Virginia fort of 1756 had been destroyed by the Indians in the course of the recent conflict,[27] and so Fort Robinson, on the Long Island of the Holston, had been erected by the Virginia troops, as it happened, just before the conclusion of hostilities.[28]

With the Cherokee in dire need of European goods, Fort Robinson might well have become the center of a thriving trade. That it did not become such would seem to be owing largely to the apathy of the provincial government. In the very month in which peaceful relations were resumed Governor Fauquier stated to the Virginia assembly that he was "utterly unacquainted with the Advantages to be expected from carrying on a Trade with" the Cherokee, and that he would "refer the consideration of this matter wholly" to that body.[29] But the assembly appeared no more interested than the governor in the development of the colony's peltry trade, so no official action was taken. In the meantime, individual traders were wending their way, as of old, along the path to the Cherokee country, where they disposed of their wares at advanced rates.[30] It seems, too, that in 1761 Nathaniel Gist purchased from the Indians, for trading purposes, the Long Island of the Holston,[31] possession of which had been sought, seven years before, by Richard Paris. A military ob-

[25] *Va. Gazette,* January 16, 1761.
[26] Williams, *Timberlake's Memoirs,* 96.
[27] *Ibid.,* p. 58, n. 30. On Timberlake's map appears the legend: "Built by the Virginians 1756 and soon after destroyed by the Indians". See also Henderson, *Old Southwest,* 68, and Reuben Gold Thwaites, *Daniel Boone* (New York, 1902), 50.
[28] S. C. Williams, "Fort Robinson on the Holston". in East Tenn. Hist. Soc., *Publications,* No. 4 (Knoxville, 1932), 22-31.
[29] *Va. Burgesses, Journals,* 1761-1765, p. 6.
[30] C. O. 5: 65, p. 534.
[31] Summers, *Southwest Va.,* 83.

server, leaving the Cherokee towns in March, 1762, noted at the evacuated Fort Robinson a goodly store of flour and other goods that had belonged "to a private trader",[32] referring, possibly, to Gist. Some Virginians took advantage of the collapse of the scheme for a public trade and bought, preparatory to entering the trade themselves, goods from among those thrown on the market by the "Trustees of the Indian Factory".[33]

But the wants of the Cherokee were many, and apparently they could not be met by the Virginians independently trading among them, for they continued to request a greater trade. One delegation appeared before the council in January, 1762, receiving a very encouraging reply;[34] then the military observer referred to above was instructed a few weeks later by the headmen of the nation "to press the Governor of Virginia to open trade";[35] and before the year was out there were doubtless other, but unrecorded, attempts of the Indians to increase the volume of traffic. An unusual opportunity to smooth over trading difficulties was afforded by the gathering at Augusta, Georgia, in November, 1763, of representatives from most of the southern colonies and from most of the southern Indian nations. The conference was called by John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the Southern District of North America,[36] primarily for the purpose of explaining to the red men the changed political situation brought about by Britain's defeat of France and Spain in the late war. This done, the matter of trade came up for discussion. According to Attakullakulla, Virginia traders had been coming among his people, but for their goods they had asked ". . . . exorbitant prices, and got their Skins for almost nothing. . .", and judging by the fact that the emperor was now asking for "good Traders, staid men", several of them had probably been "young riotting Fellows", who had committed disturbances. Especially desired were traders from Virginia, but in his reply to the delegation of mountain Indians Superintendent Stuart stated that the provincial government could not require the private trader to go anywhere, that the latter could and would follow his own inclinations, and that the price of goods depended entirely upon the agreement reached between him and the Indian purchaser.[37] However, the treaty which concluded the conference did provide, among other things,

[32] Williams, *Timberlake's Memoirs,* 38.
[33] See, *e. g., ibid.,* 128, and *Va. Burgesses, Journals,* 1761-1765, pp. 298-299.
[34] *Va. Mag.,* XVI (1908), 142.
[35] Williams, *Timberlake's Memoirs,* 117.
[36] The office had been created in 1755, but Stuart's appointment was of recent date.
[37] C. O. 5: 65, pp. 534, 539, 540, 552.

that the superintendent and the southern governors should encourage the traders to frequent the Indian towns,[38] although it remained to be seen how faithfully this provision would be observed.

The Cherokee war had wrought the ruin of the recent scheme for a public trade. With the close of hostilities trade relations had been resumed and, owing to the urgent need of the red men for supplies, the interchange of commodities had gone forward at a rapid rate. But when the most pressing needs had been met the volume of trade naturally declined, and many traders then sought other employment. In the spring of 1765 a report was sent the Indian superintendent as to the number of traders in the Cherokee nation, and those from the Old Dominion received bare mention.[39] In view of the Virginia government's traditional reluctance to become connected with the Indian trade,[40] it is difficult to explain why the "Trustees of the Indian Factory" were now revived, or recreated. The sum of 2500 pounds was appropriated for the use of the trustees, goods were to be ordered from England, and the Cherokee trade placed on a non-profit basis.[41] To serve as factor, a certain David Ross was selected and, although the assembly had passed the bill in May, 1765, it was exactly a year later before Ross made his appearance among the Cherokee. The latter had already asked the Virginia government to use its good offices in mediating between themselves and the Ohio Indians, chiefly the Shawnee, with whom they had been at war for a long while. The governor and council cheerfully acquiesced, for they knew very well that Shawnee raiding parties would not hesitate to attack Virginia caravans carrying supplies to their own enemies.[42] The officials, however, hoped for not only peace with the Ohio Indians, but trade as well; in fact, they were to be supplied from the same warehouse as the Cherokee.[43] This warehouse was to be located at the Long Island of the Holston, and it was especially to acquaint the Indians with the design that Factor Ross had come among them in the spring of 1766. The Cherokee, however, refused to entertain the project for a moment. About the Long Island, they said, lay their very best hunting grounds; cattle belonging to the whites might be slain by careless warriors; trouble would ensue; and eventually the entire trading scheme would pos-

[38] C. O. 5: 65. p. 560.
[39] C. O. 323: 23, L 4. None of the traders in the report held Virginia licenses, but two of them were referred to as the "Gentlemen from Virginia".
[40] The act of 1757 was, of course, a war measure.
[41] Hening, *Statutes,* VIII, 114-118; *Va. Burgesses, Journals,* 1766-1769, *passim.*
[42] Clarence Edwin Carter, (ed.), *The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State,* 1763-1775 (New Haven, 1931), I, 222.
[43] C. O. 5: 66, p. 808.

sibly be overthrown. Therefore, it would be wise not to establish a trading post nearer than Chiswell's Mine.[44] To the factor this was a disappointment, truly enough, yet he was able to leave a good impression among the red men both by his demeanor and by his promise to send them "Ammunition in a couple of Moons, if the Norwards [i. e., the northern Indians] [would] permit him."[45] The ammunition may have been sent, but the silence of the records would seem to indicate that it was not. Be that as it may, a strange rumor arose. According to report received by Superintendent Stuart, Factor Ross, following his conference with the Cherokee in May, 1766, had returned to the Old Dominion, collected a cargo of goods, and started back to the Indian country. Before reaching their destination, however, Ross and six associates were set upon and brutally murdered.[46] Stuart believed that the outrage had been perpetrated by Cherokee hot-heads, bent upon vengeance for the killing, a year or so before, of several of their warriors in the frontier county of Augusta. [47] A message of sharp protest was sent the head-men of the nation,[48] who courteously, but firmly, denied the allegations made against them, and stated further that a careful investigation had failed to reveal any evidence concerning a murder of any kind.[49] As a matter of fact, Ross had not been murdered, the report being, as the superintendent informed Governor Fauquier a little later, "without foundation".[50] The origin of the rumor remains uncertain. When David Ross returned from the Indian country at some date prior to December, 1768, he reported to the Trustees of the Indian Factory that commercial intercourse with the Cherokee would be attended by many "Inconveniences", and it was this discouraging report which caused the trustees to abandon the project of a public trade.[51]

Yet it was just as well that the board of trustees gave up hope of expanding the Cherokee traffic in the manner planned, for in June, 1767, the English privy council disallowed the Virginia statute

---

[44] Where Wytheville, Virginia, is now located.

[45] C. O. 5: 66, p. 820.

[46] C. O. 5: 68, p. 197. Stuart's report was from an agent in the Cherokee country, and was dated January 21, 1767. See, too, *Gage Correspondence,* I, 134, 138.

[47] For the Augusta county incident, consult C. O. 5: 1331, pp. 17-25.

[48] C. O. 5: 68, p. 200.

[49] C. O. 5: 68, p. 207.

[50] C. O. 5: 68, pp. 241-242. The letter was dated April 11, 1767. Consult also *Gage Correspondence,* I, 140.

[51] C. O. 5: 71, p. 129. "Inconveniences" probably referred to the Shawnee menace, Cherokee opposition to a warehouse on the Long Island, and the too easily inflamed spirits of many of the younger warriors.

calling the trustees into existence.[52] The repeal was brought about partly through the efforts of the Indian superintendent, John Stuart. Ever since his appointment, Stuart had hoped for an increase of power whereby he might attain some degree of order in the Indian country, which object it seemed impossible to achieve so long as the colonial governors in his district could, with impunity, flout his authority. By the royal proclamation of 1763 the territory west of the Alleghanies was closed to the settler, but opened wide to the Indian trader, who had only to obtain a license from a colonial executive.[53] It was not the intention of the home government, however, to free the individual trader from restraint, rather, it was to bring about this very restraint that a new plan, that of July 10, 1764, was announced. Every colonial law respecting the trade was to be repealed; the entire Indian country was to become a vast reservation, subject only to imperial law administered by imperial officials—the superintendents and their commissaries. Every trader, although licensed by the governor of his respective colony, once he passed within the red man's territory, was to observe carefully the imperial regulations, such as the prohibition placed upon the sale of rum to the natives.[54] In the southern Indian district Superintendent Stuart was ordered to inaugurate the new system at once, and this he attempted to do. Shortly thereafter came the re-establishment of the Virginia Indian Factory, and its work the superintendent felt it his duty to condemn. To supply the Cherokee at cost, he said, would evoke from neighboring nations a demand for a similar reduction of rates; the other colonies, unlike Virginia, could not subsidize a profitless trade; and in the end his Majesty would be forced to assume the responsibility of supplying all the Indians under British protection.[55] Had Stuart but known it his fears were phantoms, for the plan had been dropped by Virginia even before it had been vetoed by the privy council. This unpleasant situation, however, did show clearly enough that the superintendent and the Old Dominion were working at cross purposes; for the success of the plan of 1764 such boded ill.

Impressed by the enormity of the offenses committed by irresponsible traders in the Indian country, and authorized to do so by the home government, Superintendent Stuart drew up in the spring of

---

[52] *Acts of the Privy Council,* 1766-1783, pp. 36-37.

[53] C. O. 5: 65, pp. 231 *et seq.*

[54] E. B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, (eds.), *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (Albany, 1856-1887), VII, 637 *et seq.*

[55] C. O. 5: 67, pp. 92-95.

1767 a number of trading regulations.[56] Besides stating in detail what each trader might, or might not do, the regulations provided that each license to trade must be approved by the proper commissary. Within a short time Governor Fauquier was studying Stuart's scheme and devising a reply to his request that Virginia cooperate in promoting harmony among the red nations to the west. "I know nothing", Fauquier wrote, "of the Proclamation of the 7th October, 1763",[57] for it was this that Stuart had cited as his authority to issue the regulations. The governor would not deny the desirability of uniform trade regulations, but in the absence of any instructions from the home government he felt powerless to act. Virginia law required no licenses of those engaging in the Indian trade, and if he moved in this direction he would be "infringing the Liberty of the Subject".[58] Such defiance the superintendent did not encounter in the other provinces, and in the summer following he instructed the southern governors to enforce an additional restriction, namely, that all traders should be bonded in individual amounts of three hundred pounds.[59] Fauquier's comment was that, although he could prevent no one from trading, he knew "of no law to Restrain [him] from granting licenses to all who apply for them", and that he imagined there would be many such "when they find themselves under difficulties for want of them".[60] Bonding the traders could be done only by the provincial authorities, and herein Fauquier enjoyed the advantage. The governor never mentioned the matter of bonds to Stuart, but the latter doubtless interpreted Fauquier's silence to mean that in Virginia he need expect no observance of his latest regulation.[61] And if Virginia persisted in acting independently, even though every other southern colony obeyed Stuart's instructions, his plan for a uniform trading system among all the Indians of his district might have to be abandoned.

Apparently, there was little more that the superintendent could do; the governor of Virginia stood adamant in his opposition to the imperial plan. Waiting brought an unexpected result; in March, 1768, Francis Fauquier died, his death removing what appeared to be the one great obstacle in Stuart's path. The president of the provincial council, John Blair, now became acting governor; his attitude toward a uniform trade Stuart did not, of course, know, but

[56] C. O. 5: 68, pp. 219 *et seq.*
[57] This statement was not exactly honest. Consult C. O. 5: 69, p. 313.
[58] C. O. 5: 70, pp. 273-274.
[59] C. O. 5: 68, p. 271.
[60] C. O. 5: 69, p. 265.
[61] The Stuart-Fauquier controversy is summarily reviewed in *Gage Correspondence,* I, 144-145.

he immediately informed Blair that all Virginia traders must obtain licenses from their governor and that he, Stuart, would be duty bound to prevent those without licenses from entering the Indian country.[62] As events proved, however, it mattered not at all what Blair thought; it was the English ministry, not a recalcitrant governor, that blasted Stuart's fond hopes. In a communication dated mid-April the superintendent was told that economy and other reasons had dictated the abandonment of the plan of 1764 with its highly imperialized Indian relations, and that the regulation of trade would revert to the individual colonies.[63] Theoretically, Virginia now resumed that freedom of trade which she had enjoyed prior to 1764; actually, it was not resumption at all, for Virginia had never regarded the plan of that year as binding in the least degree, but on the contrary had continually disregarded it.

As the colonial period wore on the character of the Indian trader became progressively worse. Time was when worthy whites had gone among the red men, had taught them the simple mechanic arts, had increased their knowledge of agriculture, had extended them long-term credits, and by so doing had won the respect and confidence of the natives.[64] That time had long since passed, and now it was exceptional to hear a trader spoken of kindly. Governor Dinwiddie, who, during the darkest days of the French and Indian war, had reluctantly requested the traders' assistance, referred to them as "abandoned Wretches".[65] Between 1764 and 1768 all traffic had been, supposedly, under the supervision of imperial agents, yet it was one of the latter, unsparing in his condemnation of the traders, who wrote from the Cherokee country that "No Nation was ever so infested with such a set of Villains, and horse thieves".[66] When the experiment in imperial control was abandoned, conditions which were already reprehensible became well nigh intolerable.[67] According to Superintendent Stuart, it was only the red men's "incapacity of subsisting without European Commodities, as well as the fear of involving their Country with us; [that]renders them so passive to the enormities of the Traders".[68] Stuart exerted himself to obtain

[62] C. O. 5: 70, pp. 294-295.

[63] C. O. 5: 70, p. 313. The commissaries were withdrawn from the Indian country, although some remained as deputies of the superintendent, whose office was not abolished by the decision of 1768.

[64] James Adair, *The History of the American Indians* (London, 1775), 414.

[65] *Dinwiddie Letters*, II, 50.

[66] C. O. 5: 67, p. 429. The date was August, 1766. Note also General Gage's castigation of the traders as a class, *e. g., Gage Correspondence*, I, 96-97.

[67] C. O. 5: 70, p. 493.

[68] C. O. 323: 17, p. 497. The statement was made in 1764, but it would have applied with even greater force to the years following 1768.

the enactment by the provincial assemblies within his district of similar laws regulating the trade, but the results were very disappointing.[69] And so the quasi-chaotic conditions in the Indian country continued.

Then, too, there were other things to ruffle the red man's temper. It has already been pointed out that white encroachment upon Indian hunting grounds was one of the inciting causes of the Cherokee War. Following the close of that conflict, and of the war with France, the westward pointing tide of settlement was held in leash by fear of the Indians, by inertia produced by the demands of the recent war, and by the king's proclamation of 1763.[70] Held in leash, but not for long; by the late 1760's settlers were swarming across the Alleghenies and pouring down those rich western valleys through which coursed streams wending their way to the Mississippi.[71] From Virginia and North Carolina came bands of pioneers, roving in the general direction of the Cherokee towns, and some of these continued on until by 1769, they had planted on the banks of the Watauga River the most advanced white settlement.[72] To quiet the fears which several Indian nations entertained of English encroachments, Superintendent Stuart sought to negotiate with the red men a series of treaties, carefully defining the western boundaries of the southern colonies. At Hard Labour, South Carolina, in 1768, the Cherokee assented to a proposal for delimiting their territories with respect to Virginia. The line as provided for[73] did not, however, run as far to the westward as the Old Dominion wished, with the result that vigorous protests were made. Stuart pointed out that the advance of white settlers would inevitably wreck the Indian trade, an important factor in preserving harmonious relations between the races. This Virginia, although she attempted to evade the issue, could not deny, and she at length countered with the argument that the returns from traffic with the natives could not be expected to equal the profits to be derived from the employment in the new lands of industrious laboring men. Virginia, then, was willing to sacrifice the peltry trade, and this she did, in a sense, when her insistence brought about the desired westward extension of the boundary line. By the treaty of Lochaber, 1770, the line was to begin at

[69] Clarence Walworth Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics* (Cleveland, 1917), II, *passim.*

[70] Forbidding settlement west of the Alleghenies.

[71] Consult Justin Winsor, *The Westward Movement* (Boston and New York, 1897).

[72] Ramsey, *Annals of Tenn.*, 93-103. The Watauga settlement was located near the present Elizabethton, in upper East Tennessee.

[73] C. O. 5: 70, pp. 153-198.

a point six miles east of the Long Island of the Holston and run north to the confluence of the Kanawha and Ohio rivers.[74]

It had been difficult enough to arrange a satisfactory boundary, but it was even more difficult, nay, impossible, to keep the whites on their side of the line. And if the red man disliked the encroaching settlers, how much more cordial must have been his dislike of those who went just in advance of those same settlers, that is, the hunters. Following the paths long used by the traders, these hunters went well beyond the limits of settlement and there proceeded to obtain deer-skins by the simple art of shooting the animals and then skinning them. The hunter possessed certain distinct advantages over the trader: the former halted when he reached the hunting grounds, while the latter had to journey to the native villages; and instead of the trader's bulky pack, the hunter carried only his rifle and a goodly supply of powder and shot. But to poach upon Indian preserves was a dangerous occupation, as not a few of the hunters discovered; when caught by the Cherokee the poachers would be roughly rebuked and released only after they had been relieved of the skins they had accumulated.[75] But the profits, in an enterprise which required practically no original outlay, were so great that the hunters determined to run the risk of encountering Indian opposition. Soon, it seemed to the Cherokee that their guns were "Ratling every way",[76] and then, as if to overawe the red men, they began to coalesce into great groups, in one recorded instance counting half a hundred rifles and threatening to shoot the Cherokee themselves for having protested against the vast slaughter of deer.[77]

The situation was aggravated enough, to be sure, but there was an additional complication afforded by the incursions of the so-called northern Indians,[78] in reality, the Shawnee and neighboring tribes of the Ohio Valley. Between these Indians and the Cherokee there lay the land of Kentucky, abounding in game, but not occupied by any nation of red men. It was in fact, a no-man's land, frequented by hunting parties from both north and south, and it is not surprising that, at times, these parties clashed.[79] "Wars" rather easily arose, and bands of young warriors, lusting after scalps, would betake themselves into the enemy country, where, along some oft trod trail they would lie in wait until there appeared a weaker detach-

[74] C. O. 5: 72, pp. 57-61.
[75] C. O. 5: 75, p. 435.
[76] C. O. 5: 70, pp. 595-596.
[77] C. O. 5: 72, p. 49; *Gage Correspondence*, I, 222.
[78] The "northern Indians" of the seventeenth century generally meant the Iroquois.
[79] C. O. 5: 71, p. 122.

ment of the foe, upon whom they would fall in what would probably be reported as a sanguinary "battle".[80] Periods of peace and strife alternated, but as the 1760's advanced those of peace came to be of briefer duration. To the Indian superintendents, Sir William Johnson in the northern district and John Stuart in the southern, such intertribal conflict was most undesirable; it menaced the safety of traders and, besides, other tribes might at any time be drawn in, rendering control of the situation problematical. Johnson and Stuart, therefore, exerted themselves to effect a reconciliation, and the Cherokee even sent a delegation of chieftains to New York and later to Pittsburgh to negotiate. All efforts, however, proved unavailing, and still the "northern Indians" sent raiding parties far into the Cherokee country, leaving that nation in a state of constant anxiety.[81]

Small wonder that Virginia's trade with the Cherokee was steadily declining. The mountain Indians were in a dangerous mood, occasioned by the malpractices of traders, the trespassing of hunters, the approach of white settlements, and the fear of raids by their red foemen from the Ohio. Nevertheless, times had changed, and goods upon which the Cherokee had once looked as desirable, but nonessential, had now become necesssities; their dependence upon goods of European manufacture was almost complete.[82] Regardless, then, of the Indian's real attitude toward the white man, it was necessary to assume the guise of friendliness and respectfully petition for supplies. From Virginia the Cherokee received virtually no encouragement. When the provincial government became convinced of the impracticability of a public trade and ordered the abandonment of the 1765 project it set its face firmly in one direction and thereafter refused to budge; to all later schemes savoring of subsidized intercourse it turned a deaf ear. For that matter, the Old Dominion failed even to regulate private trade. As previously pointed out, Governor Fauquier had made no requirement of trading licenses, and had made no attempt to have his assembly pass a licensing law. Doubtless some Virginians fell into the easy habit of carrying goods

[80] For one of the Cherokee-Shawnee "battles" see G. W. L. Bickley, *History of the Settlement and Indian Wars of Tazewell County, Virginia* (Cincinnati, 1852), 53.

[81] In C. O. 5: 70-75 there are numerous, though scattered, references to the desultory conflict between the Cherokee and the nations of the Ohio country. See also *Gage Correspondence,* I, *passim.*

[82] Superintendent Stuart had spoken of this as early as 1764 (C. O. 323: 17, p. 497). For their deer-skins the Cherokee demanded a wide variety of goods, some of which were as follows: blankets, shirts, handkerchiefs, knives, beads, oil, wire, hoes, hatchets, paints, guns and ammunition (C. O. 323: 24 T 44). See, too, *Gage Correspondence,* I, 278, 335.

to the Cherokee without troubling to obtain express permission for so doing, and therein probably lies the explanation of Acting Governor Blair's statement to the home government in 1768 that he knew of no one in the colony then engaged in the Indian trade.[83] Unless applications for licenses had been made to the governor, or unless the trade was great enough to attract public notice, he would hardly have known of it, as was, of course, the case. Those Virginians who did venture into the traffic[84] were few in number and quite unable to supply the Cherokee with more than a minimum of necessary articles, hence the repeated requests for a greater trade.

These requests were made at every opportunity, and the plight of the mountain Indians was carried to the attention of the Virginia government through various channels of communication. At one time it might be through the superintendent at some Indian congress,[85] at another through Virginia agents,[86] or again, as in the summer of 1770, by special messenger sent directly to the provincial council at Williamsburg. In the latter instance, the native complaint was that the Old Dominion had been very neglectful, that war was threatening with the Creek Indians, that in such eventuality supplies from Carolina would be cut off, and that the Cherokee would be left destitute unless aid was sent by their white "brothers" to the north.

The response of the governor, now Lord Botetourt, was to the effect that Virginia had recently tried the experiment of a public trade, that so many dangers had attended it that it could not be maintained, that so far as he knew those dangers still existed, that a private trade was the only kind to be depended upon, that such would be great or small depending upon the mutual profits derived therefrom, and that he hoped the problem of supplying the Cherokee would in large measure be solved by the projection of white settlements nearer their towns.[87] In this latter observation the governor failed to take into consideration the fact that the extension of white settlement connoted the delimiting of the red man's hunting grounds, the only source from which he derived his peltry, which was in turn all that he could offer the trader in exchange for the varied com-

[83] C. O. 5: 1346, p. 187.

[84] That Governor Blair's statement was misleading is shown by the fact that the English customs records indicate no break in the importation of peltry from Virginia.

[85] As at the congress of Lochaber in 1770 (C. O. 5: 72, p. 66).

[86] As Lewis and Walker, when (1769) they were discussing with the Indians the subjects to be considered at the Lochaber congress (*Va. Mag.*, XIII (1905-1906), 33-34).

[87] C. O. 5: 72, pp. 69-75.

modities he so urgently needed. At times, too, as in 1774, the peltry market sank to such low levels that the trader would receive so little for that which was so troublesome to obtain that a trip into the Indian country was hardly remunerative.[88] But even when quotations ranged high, promising the trader handsome profits, he was compelled to consider the matter of his personal safety. Participation in the Cherokee trade was attended with enormous risk. Along the trading path one might be ambushed and murdered by the "northern Indians", and when the Cherokee towns were reached one's sense of security was little heightened, what with the rising tide of resentment against the whites in general and the traders as a class. Richard Paris, whose acquaintance with the Cherokee dated back to the beginning of the French and Indian War, continued to trade as usual and there may have been others so admired by the Indians that their personal safety was assured.[89] Such, however, was very exceptional; most of the older traders must have deserted the calling, and there was certainly nothing about the trade to attract newcomers.

The knell of Virginia's traffic with the Cherokee had sounded. Strong bands of white hunters slaughtered the deer in what had so recently been the red man's hunting grounds, and those animals that escaped the hunters' marksmanship would inevitably be driven away by the onward rush of white settlement. By chance it was the American Revolution that brought to an end a trade, the collapse of which could not have been long delayed.

[88] C. O. 5: 75, p. 352. The Indians were never able to understand shifts in commodity prices, brought about by market fluctuations (Adair, *Amer. Indians*, 170).

[89] In 1770 the Cherokee wished to bestow upon Paris, his son, and a friend some land as a token of appreciation (C. O. 5: 72, p. 69).

NATHANIEL GIST, FATHER OF SEQUOYAH

By Samuel C. Williams

The founder of the Gist family, of Maryland, was Christopher Gist, or Guest, who migrated from England and settled in Maryland on the south side of the Patapsco River in 1682, but removed in 1691 to Baltimore county. He married Edith Cromwell, of the family of the great Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of England. Their son, Richard (1684-1741), was the father of Christopher Gist, who is known in history as an explorer of the West in 1750 and as a guide of young George Washington in the Ohio River region in 1753 to ascertain the strength of the French. His journal of the expedition is the foundation of much of the early history of the West.

Christopher Gist II married Sarah Howard in Maryland, where three sons were born to them. The first of these was Richard, born September 2, 1729, who was killed in the Battle of King's Mountain, 1780.[1] The second was Nathaniel, our subject, who was born October 15, 1733; and the third was Thomas, who is said to have settled in Kentucky after the Revolutionary War, in which he was a training officer.

Nathaniel Gist bore the name of his father's younger brother, Nathaniel, and in confusion the uncle is credited by some with the adventures of the nephew among the Cherokee. Another brother of Christopher was William Gist.

Young Gist was evidently a visitor, for trade purposes, to the Overhill Cherokee as early as 1753. Manifestly, he was the son referred to by Christopher Gist in the following excerpt from the *Journal* that he kept in 1753 while on a tour to the waters of the Ohio with Major George Washington: "A messenger came with

[1] "Richard Gist, a brother of Nathaniel, was at King's Mountain and fell there within thirty steps of the British line, of which I am a yet-living witness. He was a close neighbor of my father." Benjamin Sharp in *American Pioneer*, II, 66. The father of Sharp lived near the site of the present Bristol, Tenn.-Va. Richard Gist was in Col. William Campbell's command. He seems to have had a son named Nathaniel in honor of his brother. L. P. Summers, *Annals of Southwest Virginia* (Abingdon, Va., 1929), 1117.

letters from my son who has just returned from his people at the Cherokees and lay sick at the mouth of Conegocheague."[2]

In 1754, at the age of twenty, Nathaniel Gist was again among the Overhill Cherokee. He and another young Virginian, eight years older than he, Richard Pearis, were engaged in the trade to those Indians, Pearis operating from Long Island of the Holston (the present Kingsport) in partnership with Thomas Price.[3]

The goods were supplied by Christopher Gist, who earlier had been in the mercantile business in Balitmore. Having failed in business there, the elder Gist was now in Virginia endeavoring to recoup his fortunes by supplying or backing traders to the Indian tribes. Both Pearis and young Gist looked with longing eyes on the fertile acres of Long Island, and as early as 1754 Pearis preferred a claim to the island with Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia. In the spring of that year young Gist bore a message from Governor Dinwiddie to the Overhill Cherokee asking that they come to the aid of Virginia in the great contest with the French for the possession of the Mississippi Valley. In the summer of the same year Pearis went back to Virginia. "Not having the wherewith to answer his credit, when Pearis came there, one Guest, his merchant, and father to the Guest who was sent into the nation as messenger from Virginia, seized on his leather and denied him any further credit, which obliged him here and there to pick up what goods he could get . . . . of inconsiderable value, which he packed in bags, and brought two white men (who fled from Virginia for the press). These he sent into Chota with a letter to Old Hop[4] desiring him to give no credit to Guest or his linguister, Oliver; that they would tell him nothing but lies, and that Guest had stole the governor's letter from him, and he, himself, was the man to have brought it. This letter of Pearis to Old Hop was laughed at."

In fact, Gist bore not only the governor's letter, but also a message from the Indians of the Six Nations in western New York, desiring the Cherokee "as mutual friends of the English to aid in expelling the French."

Pearis did not wish to confront young Gist in Chota, and avoided that town, but went to another, where his Indian wife resided. "Old Hop (the emperor) sent to have Pearis intercepted, and when he

[2] William M. Darlington, *Christopher Gist's Journals* (Pittsburgh, 1893), 80. It is not improbable that Nathaniel accompanied his father on the tour of 1751-52. "My son had the misfortune to have his feet frost-bitten (January 7, 1752)". "My son hunted up the creek, March 1, 1752." *Ibid.*, 72, 76.

[3] *Dinwiddie Papers* (Richmond, 1883), I, 266-68.

[4] Old Hop was the emperor of the Cherokee.

was brought in there were high words passed between Pearis and Gist. Old Hop told Pearis to be quiet, and asked him why he had lost his way and passed the town, and whether the governor had sent any message to his woman, and said he could compare him to nothing but a young buck in rutting time who ran hither and thither after a doe."

This quarrel between the two young Virginians in the woods of the Tennessee country was thus reported by trader Ludovick Grant to Governor Glen, of South Carolina, and in results it was of consequence. It contributed to the loss of the much needed manpower of the Cherokee to Virginians and the British regulars under General Braddock in meeting the menace of the French and their Indians on the upper reaches of the Ohio. It brought a prompt reprimand of Pearis from Governor Dinwiddie: "If it had not been for the unseasonable and disagreeable difference between you and Gist, I am fully of opinion they (the Cherokee) would according to former promise have sent some of their warriors before now to join our forces."[5]

More blamable for the defeat of General Braddock and the death of that officer than this private dispute was the adverse attitude of Governor Glen, in the view of Governor Dinwiddie, who wrote to Governor Dobbs, of North Carolina, on July 28, 1755: "If Mr. Glen, agreeable to promise, had prevailed over a number of Cherokee and Catawba warriors to join our forces we should not in all probability have been defeated, as they would have attacked the Indians in their bush way of fighting, which the regulars are strangers to; but .... that gentleman had a meeting with those two nations of Indians at the very time they should have joined our forces. He had all along, I think, done everything contrary to his duty and the service of the expedition."[6] Dinwiddie the same day addressed a sharp letter to Glen, much in the same tone.[7]

Nathaniel Gist returned from Chota to Virginia in time to take part in Braddock's campaign, serving as lieutenant in his father's company of Washington's regiment—the Seventeenth Company of Rangers—and he was in the disastrous defeat and rout of the colonial and regular forces under Braddock.[8] Indeed, young Gist had been sent out from the army camp as bearer of the messages to the

[5] *Dinwiddie Papers,* II, 76, 77.
[6] *Ibid.,* 123-4.
[7] *Ibid.,* 125, 225.
[8] A brother of Nathaniel took part along with the father, Capt. Christopher Gist. Nathaniel was lieutenant at the time.

Overhill Cherokee, and it is a fair inference that Washington sent him or recommended him to Dinwiddie for the mission.[9]

In the following year, 1756, Gist served in his father's company in ranging for the protection of the frontiers of Virginia against the marauding French Indians unleashed and made bloodthirsty by their defeat of Braddock's army.

The estimate of so just a man as Colonel Adam Stephen of the Gist-Pearis broil before the Cherokee is preserved in a letter to Colonel Washington, of date November 7, 1755: "Pearis' pretensions to bring in 200 Cherokees appears to me by advice from a rational person to be only a trick to procure forgiveness and recover the governor's countenance, after so many charges have been lodged against him by Mr. Gist. By a particular and intimate acquaintance of Pearis' it has been acknowledged that he was the principal cause of our not having the Cherokees last spring."[10]

In the sketch of Christopher Gist in *Dictionary of American Biography* the statement is made that "in 1756, he went to the Cherokee country in East Tennessee in the vain effort to enlist Indians for service, and for a time he was an Indian agent in that locality."

The journey of the son is here attributed to the father. That the father remained at the north during the period of the son's stay among the Overhill Cherokee is clearly traceable in the *Dinwiddie Papers* and in the *Letters to Washington.* Christopher Gist was kept busy in collecting supplies for the projected expedition of Braddock. No record has been found by the writer of the presence of the elder Gist in East Tennessee. It is also manifest that Nathaniel Gist was not in the decade of 1754-1764 an Indian agent among the Cherokee. That tribe was under South Carolina's management until Indian affairs passed to direct British control—first to Edmund Atkin as chief agent at the south. In 1757 the younger Gist was, for meritorious services, given by the governor of Virginia the pay and title of captain—the same title being the father's, and that fact doubtless has led to the confusion and erroneous statements.[11]

[9] *Dinwiddie Papers,* II, 26, 76.

[10] *Letters to Washington,* I, 123. Pearis was instrumental in bringing in 82 Cherokee warriors to Major Andrew Lewis' abortive campaign against the Shawnese, 1756; and Lewis had more confidence in him. Writing to Washington, Oct. 28. 1756, Lewis said: "The Warrior proposed sending a runner to the nation with one of ye guns, and likewise to acquaint them what is provided for them; he makes no doubt of a great number coming in. Wrote to Capt. Pearis to dress the runner as well as possible and send a white man with him, which is the Warrior's desire." *Ibid.,* 339.

[11] *Dinwiddie Papers,* II, 669, 671.

Nathaniel Gist was delegated assistant under Atkin to take care of two hundred Cherokee then in Virginia to aid that colony in the recovery of ground and prestige lost in 1755. No doubt this designation of Gist was due to his acquaintance with these Indians, but the service was not rendered by him in East Tennessee. He is said to have led those Indian auxiliaries in the successful campaign of General Forbes in 1758.

It is interesting to see the estimate placed by Colonel Washington on the value of Cherokee auxiliaries from the Tennessee country. In September, 1756, he wrote Governor Dinwiddie: "Those Indians who are coming should be shown all possible respect, and the greatest care taken of them. It is a critical time, they are very humorsome, and their assistance very necessary. One false step might lose us all that, and even turn them against us."

And in June, 1758, when preparations were in progress for General Forbes' expedition against Fort Duquesne, Washington wrote General Forbes: "Indians I conceive to be the best if not only troops fit to cope with the Indians [of the French] in such grounds.... They are to us of the utmost importance. I suggest the idea of sending a proper person immediately to the Cherokee nation, who may not only heal the differences which now subsists, but get a body of them to join the army in their march, and no person who has the interest of our important cause at heart would hesitate a moment to engage in such a service, on the event of which our all, in a manner, depends."

Two days before, Forbes had written to the great English statesman, William Pitt, of the Cherokee, then with him and his regulars: "If they leave us we shall lose the best part of our strength as all northern Indians, mostly our enemies, were kept in awe by the presence of so many Cherokees."[12]

Summers, in his *History of Southwest Virginia*, gives a glimpse of Nathaniel Gist and Daniel Boone in 1760: "About the same time Daniel Boone, accompanied by several hunters, visited the Holston and camped the first night in what is now known as Taylor's valley. On the succeeding day they hunted down the South Fork of Holston and traveled thence to what was thereafter known as Wolf Hill (Abingdon). Boone and his companion....disagreed and separated, Boone taking the Indian trail to the Long Island, and Nathaniel Gist, his companion, following the Indian trail to Cumberland Gap."

[12] June 17, 1758, Gertrude S. Kimball (ed.), *Correspondence of William Pitt* (New York, 1906), II, 279.

Relying, in part, upon this datum, Albert V. Goodpasture, a thorough investigator and most competent historian, in his "Paternity of Sequoyah", advances the contention that, after this hunting trip, Gist went to the Cherokee towns on the Little Tennessee River and there formed a temporary alliance with a Cherokee maiden in 1760-61, the result of which was the birth of the great Sequoyah.[13]

Goodpasture reinforces the argument by citing the facts that in Gist's petition to the legislature of Virginia asking confirmation of his title to Long Island of the Holston from the Cherokee he represented that he had obtained it in 1761, thus evidencing his presence among the Indians in that year. It is difficult to follow this thesis. There was flagrant and hotly waged war between the Cherokee and the whites of Virginia and the Carolinas in 1760-61, leading up to and including the massacre of the garrison of Fort Loudoun on the Little Tennessee. In all the communications and publicity incident to those fateful happenings the presence of Gist is nowhere indicated. In point of fact, he was in active service with the Byrd-Stephen regiment of Virginians, as one of its captains, and that regiment was marching against those Indians.[14] The regiment under Colonel Stephen built Fort Robinson opposite the Long Island, and did not proceed further, peace having been made.

If Gist obtained from the Indians a cession of Long Island it must have been when they came in to treat for peace at Fort Robinson, and not in their country below. Henry Timberlake and Thomas Sumter, of the command, did volunteer to venture there, Colonel Stephen not being willing to command such a dangerous service; but nowhere from records does it appear, and it is altogether unlikely, that Gist went to the Overhill towns under the conditions prevailing.

While dissenting from the proposition that Sequoyah was begotten or born in 1760-61, this writer is in accord with Goodpasture in the belief that Captain Gist was the father of that greatest of red Tennesseans. The probabilities point to the period of the early 1770's as being the time of Sequoyah's birth.

A valuable document is a biographical sketch of Sequoyah dictated to the poet, John Howard Payne, while the latter was, for quite a time, in 1835, among the Cherokee.[15] The dictation was by Major

[13] *Chronicles of Oklahoma,* I, 121.

[14] The fact is well documented. Order of march towards the Cherokee Country, at Stalnaker's, Sept. 20, 1761, Draper MSS., 3ZZ, 49; Chalkley, *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish in Virginia,* II, 169; *Va. Mag. of History,* IX, 416. See Samuel C. Williams, "Fort Robinson on the Holston", in East Tenn. Hist. Soc., *Publications,* No. 4 (1932), 22-32.

[15] Payne Papers, Ayres Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago.

Lowry, a mixed-blood cousin of Sequoyah, Mike Waters, a brother-in-law, and The Bark, the last named a warrior who was a close associate of Sequoyah in his youth. This manuscript sketch is entitled, "The Life of George Gist"—not Guess or Guest. In Payne's language it states: "I was informed that in 1835, the year I made the inquiry, Gist's age was about 60. He left the nation with the Arkansas emigrants from it about eleven years ago." This would place the date of Sequoyah's birth, approximately, in 1775. Another intelligent observer who saw Sequoyah before his removal to the west is in practical accord.[16]

Sequoyah's syllabary was completed in 1821, and his age then reckoned to have been "about 40". His oldest child, Teesey, was born in 1789. Sequoyah died in the town of San Fernando, Tamaulipas, Mexico, in August, 1843, after a long and trying journey westward in quest of a lost band of his countrymen. It is difficult to conceive of such a task being undertaken by a man eighty-three years of age, who had from childhood been a cripple from "white swelling" of the knee joint.

That Nathaniel Gist was the father of Sequoyah is consonant with all of many probabilities; that a wandering German peddler from Georgia was such, in 1770, as is claimed and stated by Foster in his *Sequoyah,* is unbelievable. It may be that, to shield Gist, that story was advanced, even by his mother and her family. Guess, the peddler, has not been traced in the archives of Georgia or South Carolina. It would be a remarkable coincidence had there been two men by the name of Gist or Guest among the Overhill Cherokees in the same half decade, when very few white men were to be found there.

John Mason Brown, of the Louisville bar, one of the greatest lawyers of Kentucky in his day, was a descendant of Nathaniel Gist, and in a letter preserved in the Bureau of Ethnology, at Washington, he stated that Sequoyah had visited the Gist family in Kentucky and was recognized by the descendants as a natural son of Gist.[17] Mrs. Mary Cary (Gratz) Morton, a granddaughter of the Gist still living, states that the family tradition is that

[16] Emmet Starr, the Cherokee historian, says that Sequoyah died at the age of seventy-five. *History of the Cherokees* (Oklahoma City, 1921), 45. A boyhood friend of Sequoyah, Charles Hicks, one-time chief of the nation, was born 1767—not 1760.

[17] James Mooney, in his "Myths of the Cherokee", in Bureau of Am. Ethnology, Nineteenth Annual Report, 109-11, points out as a weakness in this statement of Brown the fact that he called Sequoyah a Baptist preacher, whereas he was not even a Christian. There were Baptist ministers among the Cherokee and it may be that one of these accompanied the delegation, and that the family tradition became confused on this non-essential point.

Sequoyah once visited Lexington looking up his Gist relatives.[18] This visit may have been in 1828, as Sequoyah was going to or returning from Washington as one of the Cherokee delegation to treat with the authorities in the capital city.

The mother of Sequoyah, Wut-teh of the Paint clan, was a member of one of the leading Cherokee families, and not, therefore, likely to consort with a strolling peddler. The "Life" in the Payne manuscripts states:

"The family of Gist, on the Indian side (the mother's), was of high rank in the nation. The famous John Watts was one of them.[19] Two of his uncles were men of great distinction; one of the two was named Tahlonteeske (the overthrower)[20] and the other Kahn-yah-tah-hee (the first to kill). Kahn-yah-tah-hee was the principal chief of old Echota (Chota as known to the English), the ancient town of refuge over which he presided. He was called the Beloved Chief of All the People. It was his exclusive duty and delight to be a peace-preserver.[21]

[18] Letters of Judge S. M. Wilson of Lexington, Ky., the Kentucky historian, to the writer respecting an interview with Mrs. Morton.

[19] His father, John Watts, Sr., is said to have been of the garrison at Fort Loudoun, but this statement is believed to be erroneous. The father was among the Overhill Cherokee before that fort was constructed, and, no doubt, as a trader. He was skilled enough in the use of the Cherokee language to act as an interpreter in the making of the treaty of Augusta, Ga., in 1763. *N. C. Col. Rec.*, XI, 179; *Calendar of the Tennessee and King's Mountain Papers of the Draper Collection of Manuscripts* (Madison, Wis.), 81.

[20] The name appears variantly in the records: Talohtuski, in the Treaty of the Holston, 1791; Taluntiski, in Mooney, *op. cit.*, 533; Tollunteeskee in *ibid.*, 85, 136. In the Cherokee treaty of 1805, he received secretly a grant of two tracts of land, a square mile each, probably including the site of the present town of Rockwood, Tenn., where he resided until his removal to Arkansas at the head of a large band of his countrymen, including seventy warriors, in 1809. He became principal chief of the Western Cherokee, and at his death he was succeeded by his brother John Jolly (Ahuluaegi) the adopted father of the celebrated Sam Houston. Jolly lived on Jolly's Island in Tennessee River at the mouth of the Hiwassee. Young Houston lived there as a member of his family for about three years. In 1818 Jolly moved to Arkansas. Houston on his self-exile from Tennessee visited his "Indian Father" in the West. Jolly wrote to President Jackson, Dec. 23, 1829: "My son, the Raven [Houston], came to me last spring. . . . My heart embraced him when he arrived at my wigwam. He rested with me as my own son". The first captital of the Cherokee in Indian Territory bore the name of "Talonteeskee" in honor of the uncle of Sequoyah.

[21] Commonly called by the English and white settlers "The Tassel". The name appears as Kay-eta-eh in the treaty of 1777 at the Long Island of the Holston. He seems to have succeeded The Standing Turkey in the position of ruling chief, Oconostota being the Head Warrior. The Tassel was put forward by the latter to be the principal speaker for the Cherokee at that treaty of 1777. He visited Philadelphia in 1787 to make a charge of trespass by the whites on the lands of his people, and there met and made a favorable impression on Benjamin Franklin. For a farther account of this chief, see Samuel C. Williams, *William Tatham, Wataugan* (Nashville, 1923), 23.

"During some public assembly there was an onset of the whites—notwithstanding it was a time of profound peace—and all the Indians fled excepting Kahn-yah-tah-hee and another chief of whom there was some distrust in the nation.[22] They were both in the square where the ceremonial had been gone through, Kahn-yah-tah-hee arose from his seat, and with a white flag waving, met the marauders as they broke into the square. Both chiefs were murdered brutally on the spot."[23]

A number of white men among the Overhill Cherokee as traders were at Sycamore Shoals of Watauga in March, 1775, when Richard Henderson and associates purchased of the Cherokee large portions of Kentucky and Tennessee. Nathaniel Gist was present.

From the Cherokee country Gist in 1775 made a visit to West Florida, returning from the Mobile region when the Revolution in the south was passing into the active stage. He journeyed northward in company with Henry Stuart, deputy agent under the British, the better known Colonel John Stuart being his brother and a superintendent of Indian affairs for the Southern Indian tribes. On reaching the Tennessee river the party took water carriage towards the site of Chattanooga. Dragging Canoe had been south to confer with the Stuarts and, having returned, was now patiently awaiting the arrival of Henry Stuart at the Tennessee. Stuart wrote his brother John that the party "met at the Tenassy some white people who had come down the river in order to settle on the Mississippi"—evidently in the Natchez district. He wrote of Captain Gist that he was "well acquainted with the new settlements" on the Watauga and Nolachucky rivers and had informed young Stuart that "the settlers were very numerous".

On reaching the Cherokee towns the part played by Captain Gist was, to say the least, equivocal and it led to deep resentment on the part of the Wataugans when they learned of it.[24] He was, indeed,

[22] Chief Old Abram is here referred to. The distrust grew out of his participation in the treaty of Dumplin Creek, negotiated by the state of Franklin, May 21, 1785. Samuel C. Williams, *The Lost State of Franklin* (Johnson City, 1924), 75-77.

[23] The Tassel and Old Abram were cruelly murdered in May, 1788. John Haywood, *Hist. of Tenn.* (Nashville, 1891), 181; Williams, *The Lost State of Franklin*, 207.

[24] For comments of the astute Willie Jones, of North Carolina, on Gist at this time, see his letter to Gov. Caswell, June 2, 1776, after the return of Jones from Augusta, Ga.: "Henry Stuart was accompanied by Nat Gist and [James] Colbert, two men who are equally unprincipled and formidable. They are deep in the mystery of bush fighting, conversant in the manners and customs of the Indians and quite familiar with the frontiers of North Carolina and Virginia. Upon the whole, I am of opinion that the Overhill Cherokee either have already commenced or will soon commence hostilities". *N. C. State Rec.*, XXII, 743.

in close quarters. As a trader he must have had money owing to him from the Indians and he must have felt that his claim to the fertile Long Island should be conserved, if at all practicable. Gist knew of the plan of the younger warriors under the influence of Dragging Canoe to attack the white settlers on the Holston, Watauga and Nolachucky.

There was a group of tories in the Brown settlement on the Nolachucky. Captain Gist, as Henry Stuart narrates, "offered to undertake to give them notice if he could get four white men that knew the woods and some Indians" to accompany him. One of these white traders was Jarret Williams. "The very night before they were to set out the four that were chosen to go ran away; they were all Virginians, which was likely to prove fatal to the white people who remained. All the white people in the nation thought that the only security they could now have for their safety was to go with the Indians."

Jarret Williams, a Wataugan from Virginia, when he reached the Watauga settlement, gave information "that Alexander Cameron informed that he had concluded to send Captain Nathaniel Guest, Williams Faulin, Isaac Williams and himself with the Indians till they came to the Nolachucky; that they were to stop and Guest and the other white men, above mentioned, were to go to see if there were any king's men among the inhabitants and, if they found any, they were to take them off to the Indians or have a white signal in their hands or otherwise to distinguish them. When this was done they were to fall on the inhabitants and kill or drive away all they possibly could".[25]

Henry Stuart had endeavored to persuade or compel the settlers in what is now upper East Tennessee to move off of their lands to West Florida, promising that the Cherokee would permit their safe passage down the rivers. In one of his written messages to the settlers he thus referred to Captain Gist: "Captain Guest has been all over West Florida and from what we know of that country we venture to recommend it to you as a very fit country for your poor people."[26]

Dr. P. M. Hamer states that Gist was at the time in the pay of Cameron, assistant British agent to the Cherokee, and that "for the purpose of protecting loyalists and women and children he accom-

[25] Deposition of Jarret Williams, in James G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee* (Philadelphia, 1853), 149.

[26] Philip M. Hamer (ed.), "Correspondence of Henry Stuart and Alexander Cameron with the Wataugans," in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, XVII (1930), 457.

panied the Indians in their attack upon the Wataugans".[27] Gist, at least, did not leave the Indians for his home in Virginia. But his later claim or explanation was, no doubt, that the projected plan to leave the redmen and go to the tories on the Nolachucky was in order to get away to Virginia, and that the plan failed when the white traders escaped from the Indian towns, and that his only safety was to go forward with the warriors. As we shall see, his explanation was satisfactory to such a patriot as Major Evan Shelby and he was supported by a white trader to the Cherokee, Isaac Thomas. Too, as we shall later see, in the following year Gist wrote to the Cherokee reminding them that he had on this occasion, in 1776, warned them, before they went to war against the whites, against the step.

When, after the attacks on the upper country settlers at Island Flats, at Watauga, and in Carter's Valley, in the latter part of the same year, Colonel William Christian began his retaliatory campaign against the Cherokee, his instructions from Governor Patrick Henry were to insist upon the Indians "giving up to justice all persons amongst them who had been concerned in bringing on the present war, particularly Stewart, Cameron and Gist".

When Christian, on the march towards the Cherokee towns, reached the French Broad river, Gist came in from the Indian side under a flag of truce to the camp of the colonel. He reported that one thousand of the Cherokee from the Carolina side of the mountains had joined the Overhills, who would not give battle until the troops crossed the Little Tennessee. Christian wrote to Governor Henry (October 15, 1776): "I judge the flag was only an excuse for him to get with me. I believe he is sorry for what he has done. I did intend to put him in irons, but the manner of his coming I believe will prevent me. The officers tell me that the camp is in great confusion about him; some think that there are many favorable circumstances attending him; many are for killing him—of the last the greatest part. I spoke but little to him and don't know whether he wants to go back or not."

Two of the soldiers under Colonel Christian left accounts of this incident. Benjamin Sharp stated that the bordermen "were so exasperated at him that almost every one that mentioned his name would threaten his life, yet Christian conveyed him through the settlements unmolested, and he went to the headquarters of Washington, where I presume the former friendship was renewed. He

[27] *Ibid.*, 18. See also Philip M. Hamer, "The Wataugans and the Cherokee Indians in 1776", in East Tenn. Hist. Soc., *Publications*, No. 3 (1931), 126.

became a zealous whig". John Redd stated that "when Gist first came in to Christian he was viewed in a very suspicious light; he was thought to be a spy. But the prejudice against him soon wore off and he became very popular".

Gist went to Virginia and promptly laid a memorial before the governor and the council of state. The order entered by the council December 17, 1776, was as follows:

"Captain Nathaniel Gist having presented a memorial to the governor lamenting the suspicions which he fell under with several of his countrymen, as having acted an inimical part against America by aiding and abetting the Cherokees in their late hostile conduct and desiring his excellency and the council would make inquiry into the same, as a preparatory step either to his acquittal or condign punishment, the board accordingly considered the several depositions transmitted by Colonel Christian to the governor and which had been laid before the general assembly, and moreover examined Colonel William Russell, Major Evan Shelby and Isaac Thomas, upon oath; and, upon the whole matter are of opinion that Captain Gist is a friend of his country and was acting in that character most effectually when he was suspected of encouraging the Indian hostilities."[28]

It no doubt gratified General Washington to have the record of an old friend thus cleared; and on January 11, 1777, Gist was appointed colonel of a regiment in the continental line. The newly made colonel was sent south by Washington to use his influence in bringing the Cherokee into the promised treaty at Fort Patrick Henry, Long Island. Arriving at the island on March 28, Gist sent by an Indian messenger a talk to the chiefs, a copy of which is to be found in the manuscript division of the Library of Congress.

A number of the friendlier chiefs, in accordance with a promise to Colonel Christian, came to the island to treat in April, but Dragging Canoe sullenly held back.[29] Gist then went to Chota with some of the chiefs who did attend, and returned with them to Fort Patrick Henry on the date to which adjournment had been taken, arriving on June 28. At the request of the commissioners of Virginia and North Carolina he sent a second message to Drag-

[28] H. R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia* (Richmond, 1926-), I, 78, 184, 186.

[29] Between the date of the attempted treaty in April, 1777, and that of the resumption of negotiations in June, Oconostota and a party of Cherokee accompanied Col. William Christian to Williamsburg to visit Gov. Henry. The Indians returned to Long Island with Col. Christian well pleased with the treatment accorded them at the capital of Virginia. This, no doubt, aided in the procurement of the treaty.

ging Canoe urging him to come in, but without success. The treaty proceeded, Gist sitting in council "on business from General Washington". He was influential in bringing the results desired by Virginia and North Carolina. Colonel Christian as one of Virginia's commissioners in an address to the Indians said:

"At our last meeting in April at this place, a letter from our great warrior, General Washington, was delivered to his brother, Oconostota, by one of his war captains and our friend, Colonel Gist. By this letter you were invited to send some of your young men to our general's camp. You know the pains and trouble he (Gist) has been at and how careful he has been to you in bringing about a happy peace; and he has long been a friend to your nation."

The Tassel (Kahn-yah-tah-hee), uncle of the Indian consort of Gist, replied:

"Here is my friend and brother (pointing to Colonel Gist) whom I look upon as one of my own people. He is going to leave me and travel into a far country, but I hope he'll return. Here is one of my people, the Pidgeon, that will accompany him, but I do not know of many more that will. He was once over the great water[30] where he could not see which way he was going; but this journey will be all by land and he will think nothing of the fatigue."

At the end of the treaty negotiated at Fort Patrick Henry in 1777, above the signatures, appears this "memorandum before signing":

"The Tassel yesterday objected against giving up the Great (Long) Island opposite to Fort Henry to any person or country whatever except Colonel Gist, for whom and themselves it was reserved by the Cherokees. The Raven did the same this day in behalf of the Indians and desired that Colonel Gist sit down upon it when he pleased, as it belongs to him, and them, to hold good talks on."

Colonel Gist aided while on the treaty ground in celebrating the first July 4 anniversary ever held in Tennessee. An entry on the journal shows:

"July 4 the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was observed. The soldiers belonging to the garrison were paraded and fired two rounds, each in six platoons, and for the 13th one general volley. The great guns were also fired. . . .The young warriors then closed the entertainment with a dance."

Colonel Gist took with him to Virginia seventeen Cheroke warriors who were embodied in his command, the regiment being as-

[30] With Henry Timberlake in 1761. Samuel C. Williams, *Memoirs of Lieut. Henry Timberlake* (Johnson City, 1927), *passim.*

signed to its first duty on the east shore of that state. Gist, in 1778, was an advocate of a fuller use of Indians in the American army.

The career of Gist in the Revolutionary War was a creditable one. For a time he was in command of Red Stone fort in Pennsylvania; he campaigned in South Carolina. When Charleston was captured by the British, he was made a prisoner of war. He was retired January 1, 1781.

In 1793 he removed from Virginia to Kentucky, where for services rendered as a solider he had received a grant of seven thousand acres of the finest blue grass land.

A valuable sidelight is thrown upon the problem dealt with in this paper by the narration of General James Taylor, of Kentucky, found in the Draper collection:

"When I was moving out to Kentucky in the spring of '93 I left my company some distance before we reached Redstone (now Brownsville). I understood Colonel Gist had arrived with a large number of slaves and was encamped about a half mile above the creek from which the old fort had taken its name. I called on Colonel Gist at his encampment. I found him sitting under his markee which, no doubt, had protected him and his brother officers from the storms of many a cold and dreary night. He was a venerable looking man, I should think near 60 years of age; stout-framed and about six feet high and of a dark complexion. It was the first time I had seen him, but, on making myself known to him, he informed me he was well acquainted with my father and had served, I think, in the Virginia legislature or in the state convention together, and perhaps in both.

"While I was with him a good looking youth, who appeared to me about 16 or 17 years of age, came to the markee and was invited in. He was dressed in home-spun clothes, quite neat and was a fine, tall, well-looking youth. He appeared to wish to say something to the colonel. At length he inquired if he had any business with him or wanted to say anything to him; and the colonel inquired his name. 'My name is Gist, sir', said the young lad. 'Aye', said the colonel, 'and who is your father'? 'Why, sir', says he, 'I am told you are my father'. 'Ah, indeed', says the colonel, 'and who is your mother? Betsy—Oh, very likely it may be so then; I was well acquainted with a girl of that name some years ago when I commanded Redstone fort'. The young man appeared somewhat embarrassed and the colonel appeared somewhat stumped, and I con-

cluded to take my leave as it might be more agreeable to have their conference alone on that delicate subject.

"I met the Honorable John Breckenridge moving out with his family. He was well acquainted with Colonel Gist, and said he was a great gallant in his younger days. I should not have mentioned Colonel G's name in this narration, but a few years ago I named it to one of Colonel G's family and inquired of the person if they had any knowledge of the young man. They said they had; that he had moved to the West and had become wealthy; that the whole family had recognized him as a near relative and that he had rendered the family many important services."

On his Kentucky grant Colonel Gist established his home, "Canewood", which was to become noted for the beauty of its embellishment and for its hospitality. He died there about the close of the War of 1812.

After the close of the Revolution, 1783, he married Judith Cary Bell, a grandniece of Archibald Cary, mover of the bill of rights in the Virginia House of Burgesses. The daughters of the couple married distinguished men. Sarah Howard Gist married Jesse Bledsoe, a United States senator from Kentucky, characterized by Henry Clay as the most formidable man he ever met at the bar in Kentucky; Anne Cary Gist married Dr. Joseph Boswell; Eliza Gist married Francis Preston Blair, and they were parents of Montgomery Blair, a member of Lincoln's cabinet, and Francis Preston Blair, Jr., who was a United States senator from Missouri and a brigadier-general in the Civil War; and Maria C. Gist married Benjamin Gratz, a wealthy citizen of Lexington.

Francis P. Blair, Jr., was the Democratic candidate for the vice-presidency on the ticket with Seymour in 1868; and B. Gratz Brown was the Democratic candidate for the same office, running with Horace Greely in 1872.

Missouri has placed in Statuary Hall, in the capitol at Washington, the statue of F. P. Blair, Jr.; Oklahoma has placed in the same place the statue of Sequoyah. So that if Sequoyah was the son of Nathaniel Gist, the latter is without serious doubt the only man to have two descendants named by sovereign States as representatives in the Hall of Fame.

That the family of Gist produced virile and able men is further shown by the facts that Mordecai Gist, a cousin of Nathaniel, was a general in the Revolutionary War; and William H. Gist was Civil War governor of South Carolina. Joseph Gist represented South Carolina in Congress.

The Tennessee Gists were from the neighborhood of the Moravian town of Salem, North Carolina, and evidently descendants of William Gist, brother of Christopher Gist, who for a time lived on the nearby Yadkin River. Benjamin Gist was one of the first justices of Washington county, 1777, and it was, perhaps, through visits to him that Nathaniel Gist became acquainted with the Watauga settlers. Joshua Gist, son of Benjamin, was a member of the constitutional convention of the State of Franklin and one of the two assistant judges of that lost state. Benjamin, and almost certainly Joshua, was under Sevier in the Battle of King's Mountain. These Gists were early settlers of Sevier county.[31]

Where, it may well be asked, are there descendants of the mythical Guess of Georgia? If there was such a person, where can there be found in his line, any, not to say such, evidences of transmitted force and ability?

[31] There was a William Gist in the Tennessee country who petitioned in 1788 for the recognition of the state of Franklin. He was probably a son of Captain Benjamin Gist and named for his grandfather. The elder William removed from the Dan River region of North Carolina in the early part of 1766. Adelaide L. Fries (ed.), *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1922-), I, 162. Born in 1711, he married Violetta Howard, sister of Sarah Howard who became the wife of Christopher Gist; so that, Benjamin Gist and our subject were double cousins. The names of four Gists appear in the tax list of Greene county for the year 1783.

EARLY EXPLORERS IN THE GREAT SMOKIES*

By Paul M. Fink

In this modern time, when we can see the name of the Great Smokies each day in the newspapers, when magazines are full of articles praising their scenic beauty and tourists by the thousands are flocking from every point of the compass to gain a first hand acquaintance with these mountains, it is a little hard to realize that it has been hardly a decade since this was a land almost wholly unknown, save where the lumberman was pushing his operations back into the virgin timber. Only a limited number of hardy spirits had climbed the high peaks and penetrated the deep valleys, and many were the spots that human eye had never looked upon. As late as 1920, if one had asked the average citizen of Knoxville, from whose hilltops the skyline of the Smokies can be seen silhouetted against the southern horizon, where Mount Le Conte, and Guyot, Clingman's Dome, and Thunderhead were located, the answer would more than likely have been, "I've never heard of them", and even his idea of the location of the Smoky Range itself would have been extremely hazy.

When the late Horace Kephart in 1904 sought a spot far from the life of the cities, where he could rebuild his shattered health, it was the utter lack of available information concerning these mountains that attracted him to them most strongly. His own words tell strikingly of the difficulty of finding what was hidden among the ranges. "When I prepared for my first sojourn in the Great Smokies, which form the master chain of the Appalachian System", he wrote, "I could find in no library a guide to the region. The most diligent research failed to discover so much as a magazine article written within this generation that described the land and its people. Nay, there was not even a novel or a story that showed intimate local knowledge. Had I been going to Teneriffe or Timbuctoo, the libraries would have furnished information aplently, but about this housetop of eastern America they were strangely silent; it was terra incognita."[1]

*Read before the East Tenn. Hist. Soc., Knoxville, May 6, 1932.

[1] Horace Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders* (New York, 1922), 13

At first thought it is a little strange that such a condition could exist in a region so outstanding in its physical proportions, and so close to the thickly populated East Tennessee Valley, where the first white settlements in the state were planted, a century and a half ago. But when one gains a better personal acquaintance with the terrain, the realization grows that it was this same gigantic size, this same ruggedness, that so long repelled exploration and deterred those who otherwise would have penetrated its recesses. Roads of the very poorest, and no means of transportation worth mentioning from the outside, discouraged all save the most resolute.

The first men, of course, to visit the Smokies were the Cherokee Indians, who had long lived in their villages on the waters of the Oconaluftee, Tuckasegee, and Little Tennessee rivers, flowing past the feet of the mountains, and whose trails, for war or commerce, crossed over the heights of the range. The Tuckaleechee and Southeastern Trail crossed from Tuckaleechee Cove and Little River southeastwardly through Indian Gap and on to the Lower Cherokee settlements in South Carolina.[2] Skirting the southern boundary of the Smokies, along the Tuckasegee River, was the path later to be known as Rutherford's War Trace,[3] while a short route from the Valley Towns of the Cherokee to the villages of the Overhills was the Egwanulti Trail, passing through the gap of the same name—corrupted by white tongues to Ekaneetlee—past the lower end of Cades Cove on its way to the Little Tennessee.

The open, grassy summits of the western half of the Smokies were well known to the Cherokee. Many of them bore names, and about them certain bits of folklore centered. Gregory Bald was *Tsistugi,* "the Rabbit Place", where dwelt the Little Rabbit, chief of their clan. Clingman's Dome was *Kuwahi,* "the Mulberry Place", and here the White Bear had his town-house. Nearby was *Atagahi,* the enchanted lake, where the sick and wounded birds and beasts sought refuge, and were miraculously made whole.[4] Alum Cave, too, was known to the Cherokee, its discovery being attributed to the famous chief Yonaguska, who in his youth tracked a bear to a den in its recesses.[5] The funereal balsam covered slopes of the eastern half of the range seemed to invoke a superstitious awe in the Indians, and these summits were seldom visited.

---

[2] William E. Meyer, "Indian Trails of the Southeast", in Bureau of American Ethnology, Forty-second Annual *Report* (Washington, 1928), 772.

[3] *Ibid.,* 773.

[4] James Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee", in Bureau of American Ethnology, Nineteenth Annual *Report* (Washington, 1900), 473.

[5] Charles Lanman, *Letters from the Allegheny Mountains* (New York, 1849), 90.

Just when the Smokies were first seen by white eyes is not clear. The claim has been advanced that De Soto, in 1540, penetrated to this region, but the evidence generally given has not been considered conclusive. However, shortly before his death and following some reasearch in the Library of Congress, Horace Kephart wrote thus: "It now seems likely that De Soto, in 1540, went up the Lufty, through Indian Gap and out through Tennessee. This was before the founding of Jamestown, and long before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock".[6] Unless Kephart's notes were complete on this point and are later uncovered by someone searching his papers, this interesting bit of data may be forever lost. Should it prove true, one already an admirer of the intrepid De Soto and his hardy band is forced to wonder at what marvelous means they must have employed in driving over Smoky's crests and down her defiles the herd of three hundred hogs which one narrator states accompanied the little army.

Following De Soto, there seems to be a period of some two centuries in which we find little record to indicate that these mountains themselves were visited by white man, though it is beyond question that these towering peaks were seen by the early visitors to the towns of the Overhill Cherokee on the Little Tennessee. James Needham and his companion, Gabriel Arthur, penetrated to the Overhill settlements in 1673, first Englishmen to enter the Tennessee Valley.[7] As their route southwestwardly from Virginia paralleled the ranges, it is beyond doubt but that they could see the Smokies on the horizon to their left. Some fifty years later, in 1725, Colonel George Chicken, as representative of the governor of South Carolina, visited the Cherokee, his route crossing the Unicoi Mountains, just west of the Smokies.[8] Sir Alexander Cuming travelled along the same path from Charleston in 1730,[9] as did the men of the expedition which in 1756 built the ill-fated Fort Loudoun on the Little Tennessee.[10]

In 1761 and 1762 Lieutenant Henry Timberlake, a young officer of the Virginia militia, spent some months in the Overhill villages, but like other visitors he made no reference to the high mountains so close, unless it be in his map, entitled "A Draught of the Cherokee Country, on the West Side of the Twenty-Four Mts". In this map

[6] Personal correspondence with author.
[7] Samuel C. Williams, *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country* (Johnson City, 1928), 21.
[8] *Ibid,* 98.
[9] *Ibid,* 134.
[10] *Ibid,* 192.

he delineates the Chilhowie Mountains, naming them "Enemy Mountains", and outlines the course of what is now called Abrams Creek, draining Cades Cove and the western end of the Tennessee side of the Smokies.[11]

During many of these years white traders had been visiting and dwelling among the Cherokee, but seem to have left no accounts descriptive of the mountains themselves. It is sincerely to be regretted that the steps of William Bartram, naturalist and traveller, were not directed a few miles further east when he visited the country of the Cherokee in 1776, for the pen of this gifted writer would surely have given us a word picture of the early Smokies, a picture that would be most enlightening at this late date.

When the colonies declared themselves independent of Great Britain, North Carolina was claiming jurisdiction over the western country, and was entering into treaties with the Indians for cessions of land. The Smokies, and much of the main chain along the state line, were called the Great Iron Mountains at that time, but the name was not so firmly fixed that it did not call for a more definite description, as appears in the treaty of July 20, 1777, where the bounds of the Indian hunting grounds were designated in part "from the mouth of Camp Creek a southeast course to the top of Great Iron Mountain, being the same which divides the hunting grounds of the Overhill Cherokee from the hunting grounds of the Middle Settlements".[12] This same name was used in the act of the North Carolina assembly of 1777, erecting Washington District into Washington county.[13] But in 1789, when North Carolina ceded its western lands to the Federal Government, to form the "Territory of the United States of America South of the River Ohio", a new term appears, for the boundary was described, in part, as "to the Painted Rock, on French Broad River; thence along the highest ridge of said mountain to the place where it is called the "Great Iron" or "Smoky Mountain", etc.[14] This is the first official use of the name *Smoky,* nor has my research revealed its earlier use elsewhere. When and by whom the name was coined does not appear, but it is certain that it owes its source to the same misty blue haze that also gave the name to the Blue Ridge lying to the eastward.

---

[11] Samuel C. Williams (ed.), *Memiors of Lieut. Henry Timberlake* (Johnson City, 1927).

[12] Charles C. Royce, "The Cherokee Nation of Indians", in Bureau of American Ethnology, Fifth Annual *Report* (Washington, D. C., 1887), 150.

[13] *State Records of N. C.,* XXVI, 141.

[14] *Ibid.,* XXV, 4.

Various accounts in histories and elsewhere have stated that John Sevier crossed over the tops of the Smokies in his warfare against the Indians, but the evidence does not seem to bear this out. In telling of the 1781 campaign against the Erati, Edmund Kirke recounts in abundant detail what purports to be the first ascent of Clingman's Dome by a white man. That there might be no mistake as to the peak meant, it is described as being "higher than any peak but one among the Appalachians".[15] From its summit Sevier's party was able to "trace the courses of the Holston, the Watauga and his own Nolichucky, and nearer the silvery windings of the Tennessee as it rushed past the strongholds of the Chickamaugas".[16] Though such a range of vision is seldom granted ordinary eyes, the account might be accepted did Kirke not state that "the summit was carpeted with a deep, green sward sprinkled with heather and rhododendron".[17] When one has visited the top of Clingman's Dome and rested in the dim twilight that filters through the dense tops of as thick a stand of balsam as Smoky can present, one comes to the conclusion that Kirke was romancing, and knew not whereof he spoke. Regarding the same campaign, Ramsey's account indicates that Sevier's forces crossed the Balsam Mountains at Balsam Gap and followed the course of the headwaters of the Tuckasegee River to the Indian towns, skirting the eastern boundaries of the Smokies rather than actually penetrating these mountains.[18]

For some decades following the Revolution the records of Smoky exploration are the records of various surveys, which, interesting enough in their own sphere, do not offer much detail of the mountains themselves. But in order that this account be as complete as may be, reference should be made to them.

When Tennessee was admitted into the Union as a state in 1796, its eastern border corresponded with the line of the territory ceded to the United States by North Carolina, and the boundary was described in the same terms. Commissioners were appointed immediately by both states to settle the exact location of the state line, but their labors ceased just as they reached the eastern end of the Smokies, the terminus of their survey being designated by a large marked stone set by the side of the Cataloochee Turnpike.[19] More than twenty years were to pass before the state line survey

[15] Edmund Kirke, *The Rear-Guard of the Revolution* (New York, 1887),295.
[16] *Ibid.*, 297.
[17] *Ibid.*, 298.
[18] J. M. G. Ramsey, *Annuals of Tennessee* (Philadelphia, 1853), 269.
[19] State of North Carolina vs State of Tennessee. *Report* of the U. S. Supreme Court, October term, 1914, p. 6.

was to pursue its course unto "the place where it is called Great Iron or Smoky Mountain".

During territorial days and a few years subsequently various treaties were entered into with the Cherokee Indians, ceding to the whites large tracts of land. In one of these, the Holston Treaty of July 2, 1791, negotiated by William Blount, the line bounding the Indian lands was to pass over the Smoky and Chilhowie mountains. However, all this line was not surveyed at the time, for Governor Blount's letter to the War Department, accompanying the report of the commission, says in part: "As the geography of the country cannot be known to you, there being no correct map of it, I think it necessary to inform you that the country to the east, or rather southeast of the Chilhowie mountains, through which the line reported upon, if continued beyond it, will pass, for fifty or sixty miles, is an entire bed, or ledge after ledge, of mountains. . . near which no settlements can be formed, hence, I conclude, it will not be essential to extend it".[20] From this description one is forced to the conclusion that this section of the Smokies had not yet been explored to any great extent, but that the extreme roughness of the region was well known.

There later came a demand that the line be actually surveyed, and Colonel Benjamin Hawkins was charged with this duty. His journal does not give any record of the survey beyond Southwest Point at the mouth of Clinch River, but a manuscript map in the Office of Indian Affairs plainly shows a line running a course S 76° E. from Southwest Point to the Great Iron Mountain, marked "Hawkins Line".[21] This line as marked was not in accordance with the exact terms of any treaty, and there has been revealed no authority for Colonel Hawkins action in running it in this location, yet it received official notice to the extent that in the treaty concluded on October 2, 1798, a part of the Indian boundary was "continued along Chill-howie Mountain until it strikes Hawkins's line. Thence along said line to the Great Iron Mountain", etc.[22] Later, Return J. Meigs was appointed commissioner to see that such lines were surveyed. Whether Meig's party succeeded in following the route outlined by Hawkins has long been a subject of bitter controversy, and more than one lawsuit, upon which the possession of thousands of acres of valuable timber land depended, has hinged on the precise location of Meigs' Post, the assumed end of Hawkins' Line on the

[20] *American State Paper, Indian Affairs* (Washington, 1832), I, 628-31.
[21] Officer of Indian Affairs, manuscript map No. 749.
[22] *U. S. Statutes at Large*, VII, 62.

summit of the mountains, from which point Meigs pursued his own survey.

As time passed, it became necessary that the exact location of the boundary between Tennessee and North Carolina be determined beyond the point where the 1796 survey ceased, and legislation authorizing such a survey was passed in 1820.[23] The line was run and marked in 1821 by a commission composed of Alexander Smith, Isaac Allen, and Simeon Perry, representing Tennessee, and James Mebane, Montford Stokes, and Robert Love, for North Carolina. The act of the Tennessee legislature confirming their findings reads in part: "Begins at a stone set up on the North side of the Cataloochee turnpike road and marked on the east side 'N. C. 1821' and on the west side 'Ten. 1821,' running thence on a southwestwardly course to the Bald Rock, on the summit of the Great Iron or Smoky Mountain and continuing southwestwardly on the extreme height thereof to where it strikes Tennessee River, about seven miles above the old Indian town of Tallassee, crossing Porters Gap at the distance of 22 miles from the beginning, passing Meigs boundary line at thirty-one and a half miles, the Equonettly path at 53 miles and crossing Tennessee River at the distance of sixty-five miles from the beginning".[24] In this we find first mention of Bald Rock, now known as White Rock, Porters Gap, and the Equonettly (now Ekaneetlee) Path, prominent points on the Smoky skyline. The stone described at the Cataloochee turnpike is still in place.

The field notes of William Davenport, surveyor for North Carolina in this 1821 survey, were discovered in 1910 by Edmund Jones, Jr., great-grandson of Davenport, in a secret drawer in an old sideboard in Davenport's old home in Caldwell county, North Carolina.[25] Mainly confined to the courses followed, still some of the notes are very illuminating. Every mile is marked on a tree, and we come to the conclusion that Davenport's ideas of spelling do not coincide with those of the present, for we find "burch", "balsom", and "beach". One tree he mentions is the "Mount China", a variety we cannot identify. The twenty mile tree was "at the top of an extreme high pinnacle in view of Severeville", which can be none other than Laurel Top. At the twenty-ninth mile he states at length: "The above corner is against the head of the west fork of Pigeon River near an old Indian Camp which is at a low gap at the head of Big Creek of Tennessee, and if there is ever a wagon

[23] *Acts of Tennessee,* 1820, Chap. 22.
[24] *Ibid.,* 1821, p. 45, c. 35.
[25] Unpublished manuscript, copy in hands of author.

road through the Big Smokies mountain it must go through this gap". But then we find the courses marked out and marked "wrong" all the way back to the twenty-fifth mile, where he takes a new start in a different direction. The inference drawn from this is that at the "Jump-off" on Mount Kephart, Davenport missed his way, and instead of following the true divide, turned off along "the Boulevard" toward Le Conte. His gap for a road was in the low saddle just under Myrtle Point, and he only discovered his mistake when he reached its heights. Then as now, Smoky spread pitfalls for the travellers' feet.

When Charles Lanman made his tour of the southern states in 1848 he become very much interested in the Cherokee Indians, spending some weeks in the neighborhood of Quallah Town, the present Cherokee, as the guest of Colonel W. H. Thomas, the beloved *Wil-usdi* of the Indians.[26] While here he was led to make several excursions deep into the hills. To him the whole Smoky range appeared as one vast mountain, and to it he pays his respects, in part, thus:[27]

> This mountain is the loftiest of a large brotherhood which lie crowded together between North Carolina and Tennessee. Its height cannot be less than five thousand feet above the level of the sea, for the road leading from its base to its summit is seven and a half miles long. The general character of the mountain is similar to that already given of other southern mountains, and all that I can say of its panorama is that I can conceive of nothing more grand and imposing. It gives birth to a pair of glorious streams, the Pigeon River of Tennessee and the Oconalufty of North Carolina, and derives its name from the circumstance that its summit is always enveloped, on account of its height, in a blue or smoky atmosphere.

During his stay Lanman visited Alum Cave, calling it "the chief attraction of Smoky Mountains", reached by a "pedestrian pilgrimage of about six miles up and down, very far up and ever so far down, and over everything in the way of rocks and ruined vegetation which Nature could possibly devise".[28] He describes the sharp, steep ridges nearby and the depths of Huggins Hell beneath in a closing paragraph:

[26] Chas. Lanman, *op. cit.*, 85.
[27] *Ibid.*, 85.
[28] *Ibid.*, 86.
[29] *Ibid.*, 87.

> To gaze upon the prospect at the sunset hour, when the mountains are tinged with a rosy hue and the immense hollow before me was filled with a purple atmosphere, and I could see the rocky ledge basking in the sunlight like a hugh monster on the placid bosom of a lake, was to me one of the most remarkable and impressive scenes that I ever witnessed, and remember, too, that I looked upon this wonderful prospect from a framework of solid rock, composed of the stooping cliff. It was a glorious picture indeed, and would have amply repaid one for a pilgrimage from the remotest corner of the earth.

Prior to 1850 all exploration in the Smokies had been haphazard and sporadic, the secondary results of the visits of traders, travellers, and surveyors engaged primarily in settling the exact location of boundary lines. But the next decade was to see the task done in a workmanlike manner, by men deeply interested, well qualified to seek out and to record their findings. Among these we find three outstanding men, whose names have been preserved by being affixed to three of the prominent peaks of the Smokies—General Thomas L. Clingman, soldier, scientist and statesman; Samuel B. Buckley, geologist and naturalist; and Arnold Henry Guyot, geographer extraordinary, whose researches in the eastern mountains were the first comprehensive scientific study of all this region.

The name of General Clingman is remembered more in connection with the Black Mountains than it is with the Smokies, for it was following the celebrated controversy between Clingman and Professor Elisha Mitchell regarding the relative heights of certain peaks in the Black Mountains that Professor Mitchell was killed, falling to his death over a cliff while exploring the peak that bears his name. But General Clingman was interested in the other Carolina Mountains as well, references to them cropping out all through his writings. He it was who made the first measurements of the mountain once known as Smoky Dome, now Clingman's Dome, and he also caused a path to be cut to the top of this mountain, by which means Guyot ascended on the back of the first horse to reach the summit.[30] It is evident that he must have made other explorations in the neighborhood of the same peak previously, for Guyot further states: "As to that highest group of the Great Smoky Mountain, however, I must remark that in the whole valley of the Tucksegee and Ocona-

[30] Arnold Guyot, letter to the Asheville (N. C.) *News*, July 15, 1860.

luftee, I heard of but one name applied to the highest point, and it is that of Mount Clingman."[31]

S. B. Buckley's resumé of his own explorations in the Smokies,[32] is the first comprehensive account we have of these mountains, written from the viewpoint of the naturalist. It is evident that he made a number of trips, over a number of years, for when telling of certain explorations in company with Guyot in 1856, he refers to one particular trip made sixteen years previously,[33] during a period when he travelled extensively through the southern states, discovering twenty-four new species of plants and a new genus, which was named Buckleya.[34] Familiar all his life with mountain scenery, Buckley was deeply impressed with what the Smokies had to offer. He writes: "The scenery of the mountains, especially in the Smoky Range, abounds in precipices and deep chasms, surpassing anything we remember to have seen among the White Mountains of New Hampshire. . . . Such prospects pay the explorer for his toil, their remembrance is always sweet."[35]

Yet it was as a botanist that Buckley was most interested. The infinite variety and range of the Smoky flora and its wealth of brillant blossoms called forth enthusiastic comment. "Here is a strange admixture of Northern and Southern species of plants", he wrote, "while there are quite a number which have been found in no other section of the world. In the months of May and June, when the Kalmia, Rhododendrons and Azalias are in bloom, these mountains and valleys present an array of floral beauty which is indigenous to no other section of the United States. The much vaunted Western plains, with their interminable sameness, are by no means as beautiful." The size of the trees astonished him. Of the balsam he says, "It attains a greater size than Pursh or Nuttall have given it in their works." He cites, too, a tulip eleven feet in diameter, a hemlock more than nineteen feet in girth, a chestnut as big as the tulip, and a white oak nearly seven feet through. These, with others, he calls "some of the largest trees in the United States east of the Mississippi River."[36]

But it is to Arnold Guyot that we owe most, from the standpoint of geographical knowledge, for his well-planned and exhaustive exploration of the Smokies. Forerunners of his had penetrated

---

[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *American Journal of Science and Arts,* 2nd Series, XXVII (1859).
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography* (New York, 1888), I, 439.
[35] *American Journal of Science and Arts,* 2nd Series, XXVII.
[36] *Ibid.*

the range in this spot and that, described its beauty of scenery and diversity of flora and fauna, but it remained for this man of foreign birth, an American by adoption, to penetrate these mountains, spend months among them, measure their heights for the first time, and have drawn under his own direction the first map we have showing the range in detail.

Born in Szwitzerland in 1807, Guyot early showed evidences of his genius, directing his efforts to the study of physical geography. His attainments in that science brought wide recognition throughout all Europe, and he was given the chair of Physical Georgraphy and History at the University of Neuchatel, a position he held for several years, until disturbed political conditions led him to leave his native land and come to America, to join his old friend and co-laborer Louis Agassiz.

Guyot's talents were immediately recognized in his adopted home, and even before he gained command of the language he was lecturing to various colleges and scientific bodies. In 1854 he was offered the chair of Geology and Physical Geography at Princeton, a post he held for the remainder of his life. Shortly after coming to America he became intensely interested in the structure of the Appalachian System, and during the fifties devoted a number of summers to exploration among these mountains, his field work bringing him to the mountain regions of North Carolina, where he explored and mapped the Great Smokies.[37] From the beginning of his acquaintance Guyot professed himself deeply interested in the Smokies and of them he says: "By the general altitude of both its peaks and its crest, by its perfect continuity, its great roughness and difficulty of approach, it may be called the master chain of the Appalachian System."[38]

It would not be amiss to quote here what further he has to say concerning this "master chain":[39]

> For over fifty miles it forms a high and almost impervious barrier between Tennessee and the inside basins of North Carolina. Only one tolerable road, or rather mule-path, in this whole distance is found to cross from the great valley of Tennessee into the interior basins of North Carolina, and the road reaches its summit, the Road Gap,

[37] For references to Guyot's life see Leonard Chester Jones, "Arnold Henry Guyot", in Faculty Papers of Union College, Union College *Bulletin,* XXIII, No. 2 (January 1930).

[38] Arnold Guyot, Unpublished manscript memoir in the archives of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

[39] *Ibid.*

as it is called, at an elevation of not less than 5271 feet. It connects Sevierville, Tennessee, with Webster, Jackson County, North Carolina, through the valleys of Little Pigeon and Ocona Luftee, the last of which is the main northern tributary of the Tuckasegee.

Between the gorges of the Big Pigeon and Road Gap the top of these ridges is unusually sharp and rocky, deeply indented and winding considerably, covered with a dense growth of laurels and high trees, which make travel over them extremely difficult and almost impracticable. Neither the white man or the Indian hunter venture into this wilderness. Several of the highest points in the Appalachian Region are found on the western side, although not on the chain itself—such as the triple mountain of Bullhead, 6613 feet—the group first ascended and named by Buckley, Mounts Guyot, Alexander and Henry, which is according to my measurement higher still, 6636 feet—both of which are very near the watershed but outside in Tennessee.

In this paragraph Guyot particularly absolves himself from any possible criticism for having named a principal peak for himself, by ascribing both the first ascent and the naming of the mountain to S. B. Buckley, with whom he had been associated in exploration. The text sheds another interesting light on the fact that the wilds of Smoky may confuse even the most distinguished of its visitors, playing its jokes on Guyot just as it did on the 1821 state line surveying party. The triad of Mount Guyot, and its companion peaks are really not outside in Tennessee, as the geographer stated, but sit astride the state line. Professor Guyot's map and various references in his writings lead to the inference that he considered the state line as that divide lying between Big Creek and Cataluchee, following the Mount Sterling Ridge to Balsam Mountain northward along that to Tricorner Knob, an assumption which if correct would really place Mount Guyot and its companions wholly in Tennessee. Guyot's account continues:

Beyond the Road Gap, the chain of the Smoky mountains rises still higher, but the top of the ridge ceases to be so rugged and sharp, and will allow an easy path. One has been cut for my visit by the order of Mr. Clingman from the Road Gap to the highest peak. About six miles southwest of the Gap is the culminating point of the Smoky Mountains, Smoky Dome or Clingman's Mount, 6660 feet, which is thus only some 50 feet lower than the highest summit of the Black Mountains.

> From this point the chain gradually descends. The black verdure of the balsam firs which elsewhere crown the highest summits gives way to the green foliage of the Beeches and Oaks. After a short turn to the west it sends a long and powerful ridge, called the Forney Ridge, to the southwest, to the Little Tennessee. From the head of the Forney Ridge, the Big Stone Mt., 5614 feet, the main chain continues nearly due west, then curving gradually to the southwest, terminates near the deep cut of the Tennessee in the Great Bald, 4922 feet. All this portion of the Smoky Mountains from Forney Ridge is used by the Tennesseans for grazing cattle. Numerous paths, therefore, run up the western slopes, and along the dividing ridge. But the eastern slope is still a wilderness, little frequented. Here the Little Tennessee cuts that high chain by a deep, winding chasm, in which no room is left for a road on its immediate banks, the mountain nearby rising to 3000 feet above it and upwards, the point where it leaves the mountains being barely 900 feet above the level of the sea.

Much of Guyot's interest was centered in the ascertaining of the precise altitudes of the various mountains. He had neither the time nor the facilities necessary to run a line of levels to all these points, so he was forced to content himself with a barometric survey, a method that is always susceptible to much error. To guard against this, he enlisted the services of other interested persons as observers at his stationary instruments, while he, in the field, never relied upon a single reading, but took a series at each spot. The convenient and compact aneriod barometer was not in use in his day, only the much larger and more delicate mercurial instrument. To one who has pushed his way through the jungle-thick vegetation of the more remote parts of the Smokies, even in this late day when trails of a sort exist, there can be no more striking illustration of the zeal that actuated this great explorer than a mental picture of him, with but a single companion, struggling up the steep, trackless, laurel-tangled slopes of Smoky, burdened with supplies for a week or more, and handicapped still more by a bulky, fragile barometer, that must be most carefully protected from any rude contact that might wreck beyond repair its delecate mechanism. But though laboring under such difficulties, so painstaking was Guyot with his observations and subsequent calculations that the figures he cites for the various points in the Smokies seldom vary

as much as a score of feet from the latest altitudes announced by the United States Geological Survey.

Finding many of the peaks of the Smokies without a local name, or at least one which he could learn, Guyot assumed the explorer's prerogative and affixed to certain of them titles of his own choosing, the most of which, however, have failed to survive. For this reason, and because of the lack of other complete descriptive data, it was impossible until some three years ago to identify with any certainty all the points in Guyot's list of the peaks of the Smokies. But at that time, through the indefatigable efforts of Myron H. Avery, of Washington, an interested searcher for all facts regarding the southern mountains, the discovery of a map drawn under Guyot's direction by his nephew, E. Sandoz, hidden away in the archives of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, gave the key, and today the exact location of almost every item in Guyot's list has been positively settled.

With Guyot's labors the early exploration of the Smokies ceased. The Civil War intervened, and in Reconstruction days and afterward people were too busy with other more momentous affairs to pry into the secrets of these high hills. It has remained for the present generation to reveal its further beauties and attractions to the world at large.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1828

By Isabel Thompson Kelsay

"How the Election of President may result is impossible to tell. The rumor of Barter of office, intrigue and corruption still afloat, which I hope for the honor of our country there is no truth in."[1] It was February 7, 1825, and Andrew Jackson was writing to a friend the news of the capital city. Since the day when the presidential election had been thrown into the House, and that body had been faced with the prospect of choosing among the three highest candidates, Jackson, John Quincy Adams, and William H. Crawford, Washington had been filled with a wild surmise. Henry Clay, though he had run a bad fourth in the race, yet controlled enough votes in the House to make or break either of his more successful competitors. The political pot was boiling furiously as the friends of these gentlemen bestirred themselves. There were rumors that Clay had sold his strength, first to one candidate and then to another. Then from Georgia the news leaked out that Crawford, in spite of his desperate efforts at concealment, was seriously ill, probably a hopeless paralytic. The contest narrowed down to Jackson and Adams, and now rumor declared that Adams and Clay had made a bargain, the former to be President and the latter to have the first office in the Cabinet as the price of his support.

On February 9, 1825, the election was held. Clay voted for Adams. Jackson, so far, appeared "altogether placid and courteous"[2] and that evening congratulated his successful rival. But a few days later Adams offered Clay the nomination as Secretary of State. Thereupon Jackson flew into a rage. "So you see," he exclaimed, "the *Judas* of the West has closed the contract and will receive the thirty pieces of silver. . . . Was there ever witnessed such a bare faced corruption in any country before?"[3] To the end of his days Jackson firmly believed that he had been cheated out of

[1] Andrew Jackson to William B. Lewis, Feb. 7, 1825, in John Spencer Bassett, (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson* (Washington, 1926-1931), III, 276.

[2] Charles Francis Adams (ed.), *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* (Philadelphia, 1874-1877), VI, 502.

[3] Jackson to Lewis, Feb. 14, 1825, in *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, III, 276.

the presidency in 1825, and that the will of the people, as expressed by the fact that he had received a plurality of electoral votes, had been deliberately flouted by Adams and Clay. It was intolerable that such an insult to democracy should be perpetrated through his own person. Heretofore not unduly anxious for the presidency, he now turned all his energies to achieving it.

Eight months later Jackson, having been renominated for President, gave up his seat in the Senate and, leaving his affairs in Washington in the capable hands of his party managers, retired to the Hermitage. The next three years he wisely remained at home and played a part of seeming supineness. A voluminous correspondence, however, shows evidence of much quiet activity as he kept in constant touch with the leaders of his newly-forming party both in the capital and in the various states. Through Martin Van Buren in New York, Buchanan in Pennsylvania, Caleb Atwater in Ohio, Blair and Kendall in Kentucky, Edward Livingston in Louisiana, Calhoun and Hayne in South Carolina, as well as many others he kept his finger on the pulse of the nation.

At the same time he developed a streak of diplomacy and refused to commit himself on controversial subjects. No one ever retained a nicer balance on the political fence than did this heretofore impetuous and outspoken old soldier. Quite often we are diverted with the spectacle of Robert Y. Hayne trying to pin him down to definite statements or of John C. Calhoun maneuvring for his own advancement, but Jackson was not to be cajoled by flattery, and he either ignored questions of an incriminating nature or referred to his congressional record—and the latter gave scant information indeed. "My real friends", he declared, "want no information from me on the subject of internal improvements and manufactories, but what my public acts has afforded, and I never gratify my enemies."[4] Jackson knew only too well the varied composition of his party and the widely contradictory opinions to be found within it. He was aware that his supporters favored him on personal grounds alone and he picked his way accordingly.

But on matters of more intimate concern this mantle of diplomacy wore thin. All through the campaign Jackson inwardly seethed, muttered dire threats of retribution, and occasionally broke out into print whenever he felt some particularly opprobrious slander had been directed at him by the "coalition", as he scornfully characterized the Adams-Clay party. Several times his friends were forced

[4] Jackson to George W. Campbell, Feb. 14, 1828, in *ibid.*, III, 390.

to intervene,[5] and we know that they constantly urged him to keep quiet, pointing out that a display of temper would be a weapon in the hands of his enemies. "For Heaven's sake, for your country's sake", begged Caleb Atwater from Ohio, "do remember that but one man can write you down—his name is Andrew Jackson".[6] In the main these exertions were rewarded, for Jackson comported himself with unusual restraint.

This, however, was as far as the influence of his friends went. It is true that much of the actual course of events was directed by his managers, but that was only a part of the game, and the charge that Jackson was their tool is ridiculous. There is nothing in the correspondence—and it is amazingly large—to show that Jackson was the tool of anybody. In his apparent quiescence he was merely conforming to the conventional standards of behavior, for, however much a candidate may have desired office, the people liked a becoming coyness in public. And the higher the office, the greater the degree of coyness. Presidential nominees could not with dignity be openly active in their own behalf; they must comport themselves as though the candidacy were forced upon them by overwhelming popular sentiment rather than by their own choosing.

This attitude Jackson maintained with only an occasional lapse during the whole of the campaign. He often reiterated (and probably believed) the sentiment that he neither sought nor declined office and was particularly scathing in his denunciation of his opponents' methods as "a travelling cabinet ranging over the continent".[7] He refused to go to a Kentucky health resort on the grounds that it would be construed as electioneering; he would not furnish anecdotes for a biography; and he even declined to address a local Bible society, fearing that he might be charged "with having come forth hypocritically under the sacred garb of religion thus to electioneer."[8] Yet strangely enough Jackson willingly lent himself to one of the most spectacular and effective campaign devices which this country has ever seen. At the invitation of the Louisiana legislature he journeyed down the Mississippi to New Orleans to celebrate the anniversary of his famous victory. It was a triumphal

[5] Some of Jackson's friends in Washington intercepted an insulting letter which he had written to Samuel L. Southard, then in Adams' Cabinet. Another time Jackson was about to become involved with ex-President Monroe when Calhoun patched things up.

[6] Caleb Atwater to Jackson, Sept. 4, 1828, quoted in John Spencer Bassett, *The Life of Andrew Jackson,* (one vol. ed., New York, 1931), 396.

[7] Jackson to Richard M. Johnson, Sept. 1828, in *Correspondence,* III, 431.

[8] Jackson to Committee of the Davidson County Bible Society, Sept. 30, 1826, in *ibid.,* 315.

progress all the way. At New Orleans the river was full of steamboats, flags were waving, and crowds were cheering. Friends from all over the country met him, and there were four days of festivities, dinners, and speech-making. Coached by Arthur P. Hayne, Jackson's speeches created favorable comment, being eloquent and mostly of a military tenor. Throughout the country there were other celebrations of a like nature on this eighth of January, and the newspapers were generally enthusiastic, excepting, of course, the Adams papers. Adams himself was not without scornful words for the man who would travel hundreds of miles in the dead of winter "to exhibit himself in pompous pageantry".[9]

In the meantime the Jackson party had been slowly forming in Congress. Composed of many discordant elements and united on but one policy—to oust Adams and Clay—the new party might have died and Jackson's popularity have waned before 1828 had it not been for the exceeding wariness and energy of his managers. One of the most unwearied of these managers was Martin Van Buren of New York, a former Crawford man. Crawford's elimination turned Van Buren to Jackson, upon whose personal popularity he depended for success, trusting that ""favorable associations"[10] would remove the rust from the hero's Republican principles. Van Buren worked untiringly both in Congress and in the state of New York. He played an intricate game of politics with the powerful and ambitious De Witt Clinton, who for the better part of the campaign kept both candidates guessing. Early in 1828 Clinton suddenly—and not inopportunely—died, and most of his followers then lined up for Old Hickory. Another firm Jackson supporter was James Buchanan of Pennsylvania, who accomplished wonders in that state and modestly characterized himself to Jackson as "your efficient friend".[11]

A third leader in the fight against Adams and Clay was none other than the Vice President himself, John C. Calhoun. Calhoun had his own presidential aspirations and was one of those who had visions of using Jackson as a tool. Whatever claims to statesmanship he may have acquired in later life, at this stage of his career his part was hardly heroic. Hated by the Adams-Clay group and distrusted, though necessarily accepted by the Jackson camp, he

[9] Adams, *Memoirs,* VII, 479.

[10] The *Autobiography of Martin Van Buren,* ed. by John C. Fitzpatrick, in *American Historical Association, Annual Report* for 1918 (Washington, 1290), II, 198.

[11] James Buchanan to Jackson, Aug. 10, 1827, in John Bassett Moore (ed.), *The Works of James Buchanan* (Philadelphia and London, 1908-1911), I, 269.

wended a devious way through the politics of this era. A few days after Adams was elected one of Calhoun's friends warned the new President that if Clay was chosen Secretary of State an opposition would be organized under Jackson. Of this interview Adams wrote in his diary, "It is to bring in General Jackson as the next President, under the auspices of Calhoun. To this end the Administration must be rendered unpopular and odious, whatever its acts and measures may be, and Mr. Calhoun avows himself prepared to perform this part".[12] And shortly afterward Calhoun began to fulfill his threat, for the committees he appointed as presiding officer of the Senate were decidedly hostile to the administration.

After a few skirmishes the first real battle began in Congress when the young Jackson party united in opposition to the Panama Mission. The administration proposed to send delegates to a congress of the South American states which was meeting at Panama for the purpose of discussing mutual problems. The Jacksonians immediately raised the cry of unconstitutionality and quoted with great gusto that part of Washington's Farewell Address which warns against entangling alliances. Jackson himself described the Panama Mission as "a hasty unadvised measure, calculated to involve us in dificulties, *perhaps war*".[13] John Randolph raved in the Senate in speeches ten hours' long, and his words were so intemperate that Calhoun was severely censured in the press for not calling him to order. Thereupon the Vice President resorted to metaphysical subtleties and declared he had no power to call a member to order! In this instance the Administration won a victory, though a barren one, as neither of the delegates ever reached the Panama Congress.

The next session of Congress was even more stormy. The Jackson party was now so strong that it controlled both houses by actual majority. The Adams man was ousted as Speaker of the House and a new Speaker elected who now proceeded to choose the committees with the same partiality Calhoun had used in the Senate. So high was the feeling between the two parties that we find Adams recording in his diary that "there are about six Senators and forty members of the House whose rancorous spirits have withdrawn from all intercourse of civility with me".[14] Challenges to duels were not uncommon, and an actual fistic encounter took place between Adams' son, John, and a Senate printer in the rotunda of the capitol.

[12] Adams, *Memoirs*, VI, 506-507.
[13] Jackson to Buchanan, April 8, 1826, in *Correspondence*, III, 300.
[14] Adams, *Memoirs*, VII, 374.

Such was the state of affairs while the tariff bill was being prepared, and it inevitably became a pawn in the game of politics. The Jackson managers faced a particularly thorny dilemma. They had to retain the good graces of the South who hated the very thought of the tariff, and at the same time please such states as New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio who desired the tariff and whose votes were urgently needed. At length they hit upon a brilliant scheme and early in 1828 laid before the House a bill embodying not only high general duties but excessive rates on raw materials as well. This latter provision would satisfy the western and middle states who were the producers of raw materials, but it was a blow at industrial New England who needed cheap raw materials and high protection for manufactured goods. The Jackson men, both of the North and South, would unite in preventing amendments to this bill, but when it came to the final vote the Southerners would vote "Nay." New England, which meant the Adams party, of course, would also have to reject the bill, and thus the Jacksonians would have their double triumph. For the bill would fail; the South would then be content, while the western and middle states would turn their anger against the Adams forces who would be to blame for the failure of the bill, and the Jackson men of those states could still pose as the true friends of the tariff. It was a very clever scheme indeed; the only trouble was—it didn't work. For when the final vote came the New Englanders did not behave as expected. Webster and his adherents accepted the detestable bill, partly from political motives and partly because any tariff looked better to them than none at all. In such a way did the South find itself saddled with the famous Tariff of Abominations.[15] One Southern member indignantly wrote to Jackson, "The truth is that this infamous Administration has pressed this most iniquitous Tariff against the South with I believe the express hope of driving us into Rebellion. . . ."[16] But another member, more frank, admitted that they had all been influenced by political considerations, but declared that it was better that their votes be so influenced than that Adams and Clay succeed.[17]

Opposition of so determined a nature had early put the administration on the defensive. Clay, realizing that his own presidential

[15] For a detailed account of the events leading up to the tariff of 1828 see F. W. Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States* (eighth ed., New York and London, 1931), 76-101.

[16] Maj. James Hamilton, Jr., to Jackson, May 25, 1828, in *Correspondence*, III, 404.

[17] John Branch to Jackson, May 23, 1828, in *ibid.*, 403.

prospects were tied up with the coming election, fought, tooth and nail, grimly every inch of the way; but Adams' efforts were strangely half-hearted. One may indeed wonder what might have been the result if Adams had fought as hard as Clay, or even half as hard as his opponents declared he did. He was, however, despondent from the start. The manner of his election was not satisfactory to his pride and he felt that he was more unpopular than he actually was. From the very first he spoke of preparing for retirement, and as the years wore on that retirement seemed to him more and more a certainty—though a most distasteful one General Jackson would be elected, he knew, "without an interposition of Providence".[18]

This fatalistic state of mind must have affected his conduct in the campaign even more than his much-heralded Puritan principles, for the latter had not prevented his serving well in Europe. There is no other way to reconcile Adams' experience at foreign courts and long training in diplomacy with his unconciliatory attitude and sometimes utter disregard of tact. His belief in the uselessness of the struggle seems to have permeated his every action. For example, when dealing with the controversy between Georgia and the Creek Indians Clay urged discretion, pointing out that otherwise Georgia would be forced to vote for Jackson, but Adams replied that he did not care whom Georgia supported. Nor would he do anything to influence the course of Clinton in New York who dallied for so long between the two candidates. He also discouraged the most loyal of his followers, for they could hope for neither present nor future gain. To the editor of one of the Adams papers who complained that the administration did not support its friends, he declared sententiously, "I have observed the tendency of our electioneering to venality, and shall not encourage it".[19] To be sure, Adams possessed a strict Puritan conscience, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that his refusal to contribute money for the Kentucky campaign was motivated not so much by that conscience as by the belief that the money would do no good anyway. Certainly his despondency tended to emphasize his natural austerity of character, whereas a happier frame of mind would have softened it.

Yet this was the man, who of all persons, was accused of misusing the federal patronage. Jackson firmly believed that the office-holders under the government were being intimidated and loudly berated such a system! As a matter of fact, most of the office-holders were at that time appointees of McLean or of Crawford—both

[18] Adams, *Memoirs*, VII, 502.
[19] *Ibid.*, 262.

unfriendly; Adams did not replace them, and thus he himself furnished his enemies with many of their local managers. McLean of the post-office department carried on a long and veiled hostility, and Clay constantly urged that he be removed, but Adams refused at first because of McLean's efficiency and later for political reasons. Whatever else he may have done, Adams did not inaugurate the spoils system. He saw clearly the evils that would result from removing office-holders because of their political preferences and sought earnestly to avoid them.

It was Clay who carried on the actual campaign. Adams did not go among the people except on his journeys to and from his Massachusetts home. It was Clay who attended the dinners, made the speeches, wrote the pamphlets, and went traveling in doubtful sections of the country. He fought vigorously and at first hopefully, but he, too, finally succumbed to the prevailing pessimism. His health and spirits were both failing, and toward the end he even talked of resigning from the Cabinet. This, however, Adams was loath to permit, privately attributing it to Clay's desire to save himself from the sinking ship.[20]

No account of the campaign of 1828 is complete without some mention of one especially deplorable feature—the circulation of slander and calumny to influence the voters. The country was flooded with handbills, and the newspapers were full of such stories that to believe them was to believe that both candidates were abandoned criminals! Jackson, whose colorful career invited numerous such attacks, once exclaimed in exasperation that "every virtuous and patriotic act of my life is charged upon me as a crime".[21] He was called a murderer, a traitor, an adulterer, a thief, a liar. He was ignorant, cruel, bloodthirsty, tyrannical—even insane! He was accused of everything from Burr's conspiracy to trafficking in negro slaves. All the regrettable squabbles of his early life were brought up; the trouble with Sevier and Benton and the duel with Dickinson found wide publicity. His connection with Masonry was exploited.[22] The unfortunate circumstances of his marriage were flung far and wide as he was accused of running away with another man's wife. His Seminole Campaign received severe criticism. One of the stories to assume greatest notoriety was that of the execution of six militiamen at Fort Jackson early in 1815. John Binns, editor

[20] *Ibid.*, 525.

[21] Jackson to Brig.-Gen. Richard K. Call, Aug. 16, 1828, in *Correspondence*, III, 427.

[22] The Morgan affair had thrown this order into disrepute.

of an Adams paper in Philadelphia, printed the so-called Coffin Handbill which played an important part in the campaign. This handbill, embellished with heavy black coffins, told the whole story of the execution in lugubrious verse.[23]

O! Did you hear that plaintive cry
Borne on the southern breeze?
Saw you John Harris earnest pray
For mercy, on his knees?

And so on in complete and gory detail to the sixteenth stanza.

All six militia men were shot;
And O! it seems to me
A dreadful deed—a bloody act
Of needless cruelty.

There was just enough truth in most of these stories to make Jackson squirm. He had, indeed, confirmed the death sentence of the militiamen, but that sentence was justified by the circumstances. His invasion of Florida was unauthorized or, at best, the result of misunderstandings and poor communication with Washington. He had been connected with Burr, though innocently. And through ignorance of the law he had married his wife before she was divorced from a former husband. This latter episode has come in for much sentimentalizing on the part of certain historians. When the tongues started wagging about Rachel, Jackson is said to have carefully shielded her from this knowledge. After the campaign was over and they were preparing to go to Washington, she chanced to come across a particularly scurrilous article in a newspaper and was prostrated. From that moment she sickened and in three weeks was dead of grief and shame. This is a good story, but it lacks truth. There is positive proof that Mrs. Jackson knew of these stories at least five months before her death.[24] We may infer from one of Jacckson's letters that she also had heard these stories in May, 1827.[25] Jackson was especially enraged at any attack on his wife, but the advice of his friends and a streak of caution—as strong as it was belated—kept him from too rash a course. Committees of correspondence had been formed all over the country to repel these accusations and otherwise further his prospects of election, and he was kept busy furnishing them with information.

[23] The Coffin Handbill is reprinted in Jackson, *Correspondence*, III, 455-464.

[24] Mrs. Rachel Jackson to Mrs. Elizabeth Watson, July 18, 1828, in *ibid.*, 415-416.

[25] Jackson to Brig.-Gen. Richard K. Call, May 3, 1827, in *ibid.*, 355. See also John H. Eaton to Mrs. Jackson, Dec. 7, 1828, in *ibid.*, 449.

Sworn testimony was collected and published revealing the truth about the marriage as well as certain other episodes in his life.

Adams was also the victim of much abuse and slander, although his life offered no such fertile field for the play of imagination. "I write few private letters", he declared, "and those under irksome restraints. I can never be sure of writing a line that will not some day be published by friend or foe. Nor can I write a sentence susceptible of an odious misconstruction but it will be seized upon and bandied about like a watch-word for hatred and derision."[26] These attacks centered mainly about the charges of "bargain and corruption" and misuse of patronage. The latter assertion has no basis in fact. Of the former we have little proof. There probably was an understanding between Adams and Clay,[27] and, if so, it was not unconstitutional nor even unethical. The constitution expressly provided that in case of no candidate receiving a majority the House should vote upon the three highest, and this in no way obligated the House to choose that candidate with a plurality of electoral votes. If the will of the people was defeated, the constitution permitted it. Nor was it so strange that Clay should have supported Adams regardless of any bargain. Crawford's health put him out of the race, and the softly-stepping Clay had always been hostile to the rash impetuous Jackson. Then, too, Jackson's political principles were extremely vague, while Adams stood foursquare for Clay's own American system. People thought that the appointment of Clay as Secretary of State sealed the corrupt bargain, but, bargain or not, Clay was the most natural selection Adams could have made for the office, and several years later when faced with the prospect of Clay's resignation he knew not where to look for a successor.[28]

Adams was also accused of the misuse of public funds. Early in 1828 a member of the House introduced the so-called retrenchment resolutions. These resolutions proposed a reduction in governmental expenditures and were the signal for a furious political onslaught. Not only was the administration charged with wasteful extravagance, but Adams' old accounts dating back to his years in the foreign service were reopened for discussion and pronounced fradulent—and this in spite of the fact that Adams, like most American diplomats, had found his career a heavy strain on his private purse.

[26]. Adams, *Memoirs,* VII, 241-242.

[27] *Ibid.,* VI, 465. Adams' account of his interview with Clay is tantalizing in its omissions. He was not unaware of the probability that this diary would sometimes be published.

[28] *Ibid.,* VII, 216-217, 518.

Then there is the classic story of the billiard table which Adams bought (with his own money) for the President's house. It is difficult to tell whether the Jacksonians were more horrified at the extravagance or the immorality of such a purchase!

But probably the most absurd story of all was published by Isaac Hill, editor of a newspaper in New Hampshire. It related that while in Russia Adams "attempted to make use of a beautiful girl to seduce the passions of the Emperor Alexander and sway him to political purposes".[29] This drew a complaint from the Russian Minister in Washington, but no redress could be obtained.

The end was not unexpected. Slowly though the returns trickled in, it was soon evident that Jackson had won. In all he received 178 electoral votes to Adams' 83; he got every vote south of the Potomac and west of the Alleghenies plus all of Pennsylvania, part of New York and Maryland, and even one vote in Maine![30] While this was not quite the popular landslide it seemed to be, neither is it fair to charge that Jackson was elected entirely by the over-representation of the South in the electoral college, for the number of the southern electors could have been considerably reduced, and he would still have won. Moreover, so careful a scrutiny of the federal ratio and its operation would to some extent change the aspect of almost any other election. At any rate, Jackson did apparently achieve an overwhelming victory; certainly no one questioned it at the time.

The election of 1828 was one of those periodic phenomena of democracy which have from time to time enlivened the American scene. Jackson was a popular hero, his appeal rested on his great military renown as well as to a certain extent on those very qualities which his opponents decried, but which nevertheless made him appear human and understandable to the masses. The common man thrilled to his deeds of military prowess and was not especially alarmed if he fought cocks or raced horses. On the other hand, Adams, whose battles had been unspectacular and whose delights were in Tacitus and Juvenal, elicited no such warm response. Jackson's cause became most effective when transmitted through the camp-meeting oratory of the backwoods and country districts. It took a certain amount of education to understand Clay's American system, but any man could respond to Jackson's battle-cry of "bargain and corruption" and feel that it was up to him to help send those rascals packing. The victory of Jackson meant to the

[29] *Ibid.*, 415.
[30] Bassett, *Life of Jackson*, 404-405.

people who elected him a veritable snatching of the nation from the jaws of destruction and the beginning of a golden age for mankind.[31] On March 4, 1829, when Jackson was sworn in as President of the United States, Daniel Webster wonderingly described the event thus, "To-day we have had the inauguration. A monstrous crowd of people is in the city. I never saw anything like it before. Persons have come five hundred miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger".[32]

[31] One of the best interpretations of Jacksonian democracy may be found in Frederic L. Paxson, *History of the American Frontier* (Boston, New York, etc., 1924), 250-257.

[32] Daniel Webster to Mrs. E. Webster, Mar. 4, 1829, in Fletcher Webster (ed), *The Private Correspondence of Daniel Webster* (Boston, 1857), I, 473.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE RAILROAD MOVEMENT IN EAST TENNESSEE

By S. J. Folmsbee

Under the date of July 4, 1831, there came from the press in the little East Tennessee town of Rogersville the first number of the *Rail-Road Advocate*,[1] the first American newspaper to be published primarily in the interest of railroad construction. Established as a result of a meeting of citizens of Rogersville on June 21, and published by an "Association of Gentlemen" of that town, this little paper appeared every two weeks until June 14, 1832, and had as its object the stimulation of interest in what was then the novel idea of establishing direct rail communication between East Tennessee and the Atlantic seaboard. Although the fulfillment of the dreams of these early railroad enthusiasts was to be long delayed, the view they presented in the final issue of their paper proved in general to be a correct one:[2]

> Railroads are the *only hope* of East Tennessee. With them, she would be everything the patriot would desire;—without them, she will continue to be, what she is, and what she has been, a depressed and languishing region—too unpromising to invite capital or enterprise from abroad, or to retain that which may grow up in her own bosom. They are the only improvements at all suited to her condition.

Since the construction of railroads was to play such an essential part in the economic development of East Tennessee, and since the inhabitants of this section were so early, so consistently, and so vitally interested in the development of this mode of communication, it is considered worth while to present in some detail their early efforts to obtain through the medium of railroad construction a release from the isolated position in which the restraining bonds of nature had confined them.

---

1 A complete file of this paper is in the library of the Bureau of Railway Economics, Washington, D. C.

2 *Rail-Road Advocate*, June 14, 1832.

For a long time prior to 1831 the forward-looking inhabitants of this section had been engaged in the search for a more convenient access to the markets of the world. The Tennessee River, their only outlet, was a very unsatisfactory medium of transportation, not only because of the serious obstructions to navigation at the Muscle Shoals and elsewhere, but also because of the great distance along its tortuous course and the Ohio and Mississippi to New Orleans. For the importation of groceries and manufactures it was for a long time of no use whatsoever, and until steamboats began to ascend the river to Knoxville, these commodities had to be brought overland at great expense on almost impassable roads either from the distant Atlantic cities of Philadelphia or Baltimore, or over the Cumberland Mountains from Nashville. Even as a means of exporting the surplus produce of the farms and forges of East Tennessee, the river could be used only at certain short periods of high water; and after having completed the long and hazardous voyage to New Orleans, these cargoes were farther from the European and Atlantic coast markets than when they had started.[3]

One of the most popular proposals for remedying this unsatisfactory situation was the suggestion of a canal to connect the Hiwassee and Coosa rivers. The close proximity of the headwaters of these two tributaries of the upper Tennessee and the Alabama, respectively, had very early called attention to this possibility of effecting a short-cut to the Gulf at Mobile, and the citizens of both East Tennessee and Alabama made numerous attempts to obtain the appropriation of funds necessary for its accomplishment.[4] It is quite natural, therefore, that this canal project was the origin of what appears to have been the first suggestion of a railroad in East Tennessee. In 1827 a petition from citizens of this section was presented to the Tennessee legislature, asking for a charter for a railroad to connect the Hiwassee and Coosa rivers.[5]

From this proposal it was a very easy transition to the similar suggestion of a road to connect the Little Tennessee and the Savannah, which would provide a direct outlet to the coast. And by 1831, the railroad enthusiasts of East Tennessee had advanced be-

[3] *Knoxville Register,* May 12, 1824, Feb., 18, 1829; J. G. M. Ramsey, Autobiography, 17-18.

[4] W. E. Martin, *Internal Improvements in Alabama* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XX, No. 4, 1902), 34, 38; T. J. Campbell, *The Upper Tennessee* (Chattanooga, 1932), 6; *Priv. Acts* (Tennessee), 1823, p. 263. Governors' Papers (Wm. Carroll), Tennessee State Library, Nashville, Tenn.

[5] *Sen. Jr.,* Sept. 29, 1827.

yond this early conception of the railroad merely as a supplement to river navigation, and were advocating the establishment of direct rail communication with the seaboard by the construction of a line to connect with the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad then under construction in South Carolina. Contemporaneous with the advocacy of this plan, the citizens of upper East Tennessee were becoming excited over the possibilities of obtaining an outlet in another direction by effecting a connection with a railroad being projected in Virginia. Since this second proposal in its earlier phase was the more short-lived of the two, it will be considered first.

This project originated with the incorporation by the Virginia legislature early in 1831 of the Lynchburg and New River Railroad, which was designed as a continuation of the James River Canal to the upper waters of the Kanawha with a view to providing a continuous means of communication from Richmond to the Ohio River. Enterprising inhabitants of southwestern Virginia became interested almost immediately in the possibility of extending this road into Tennessee. The idea was suggested at a meeting in Abingdon on April 23, and it elicited immediate response from the citizens of Jonesboro and Rogersville in East Tennessee.[6] There followed a series of meetings in advocacy of the plan, held at various places in East Tennessee and Virginia, which culminated in a large convention at Abingdon on August 25-29. Meanwhile, a large amount of interest was developed; and although a considerable discussion occurred as to whether the road should terminate at Kingsport, the prospective head of navigation on the Tennessee, or at Knoxville, some enthusiasts, such as Solomon D. Jacobs of Knoxville, even envisioned the iron rails extending all the way to the Mississippi.[7]

The Abingdon Convention, in which most of the counties of East Tennessee and Southwestern Virginia were represented, was an enthusiastic gathering. The delegates brought with them valuable statistics of trade already passing over the projected route of the road, on the basis of which a select committee of eight reported that the profits of the company, once the road should be in operation, could not be less than 10% on the estimated cost of construction. The convention adopted a resolution advocating the extension of the Virginia road to Knoxville. It appointed committees to draw up an address to the people, to prepare bills and memorials to be

[6] *Knoxville Register,* May 4, July 13, 1831; *Rail-Road Advocate,* July 4, 1831.

[7] The proceedings of these meetings were printed in the current issues of the *Rail-Road Advocate* and the *Knoxville Register.*

presented to the legislatures of Tennessee and Virginia, and to devise ways and means of securing a survey of the route.[8]

Attention was now shifted to the legislative halls of Tennessee and Virginia, for without financial aid from the governments of these two states, in addition to the grant of the necessary charters of incorporation, the project could not hope for success. In the Tennessee legislature these early railroad enthusiasts were ably represented by General R. G. Dunlap, the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Improvements, who not only advocated the incorporation of the Virginia road in Tennessee, but urged at length the adoption by the state of the policy of making liberal subscriptions to the stock of all railroad companies incorporated by the legislature. As a means of obtaining the necessary funds he suggested that the state could borrow the money at four or five per cent interest, and insisted that the dividends on the stock would easily take care of the liquidation of the debt. He closed his report with an eloquent eulogy of this East Tennessee and Virginia project, which is typical of the extravagant claims to be made frequently thereafter as to the benefits to be derived by East Tennessee from railroad transportation:[9]

> The proposed railway, when constructed, will make East Tennessee one of the most desirable and valuable portions of the interior of the Union. It will unfold the boundless, but hidden treasures of the earth, to the enterprize of our citizens, stimulated with the certainty of a cheap and speedy road to market. It will invite capitalists from abroad to settle in our healthful highlands and beautiful valleys. It will cause extensive manufactures to be erected on our streams, the power and value of which are not equalled by any portion of the United States. It will make the whole country smile with the profitable industry of the people. It will heighten the sun of our prosperity, and gladden the hearts of a people who have been denied the equal benefits of commerce.

Although the bill authorizing the extension of the Lynchburg and New River Railroad to Knoxville passed the legislature practically as drafted by the Abingdon convention, the collateral Dunlap measure providing for a subscription by the state of one-third of the stock in all railroad and turnpike companies chartered was de-

[8] *Rail-Road Advocate,* Sept. 15, 29, 1831; *Knoxville Register,* Sept. 7, 14, 1831. For the address to the people, see *ibid.,* Nov. 16, 1831.

[9] *H. Jr.,* 1831, pp. 255-65 (Dec. 3).

feated on the first reading by a vote of 18 to 21.[10] Undaunted by this failure, the projectors of the road turned their attention to the Virginia legislature. Again, however, they were destined to meet with disappointment. A bill providing for the subscription by the State of Virginia of two-fifths of the stock of the Lynchburg and New River Railroad Company was defeated after a heated debate by a vote of 37 to 61. A short time later, the company gave up its charter and abandoned the undertaking.[11]

The *Rail-Road Advocate,* upon receipt of the news that the Virginia legislature had declined to make a subscription, commented with disappointment: "This intelligence we confess was unexpected and has severely chilled the tender shoots of hope which had so recently and sanguinely sprung up in regard to the brightening prospects of our loved but neglected, almost ruined country." The editors then continued with the advice that East Tennessee should not wait for Virginia's cooperation, but should turn her attention to the South, where the city of Charleston was waiting with outstretched arms.[12]

The inhabitants of this South Carolina city had become interested at an early date in the establishment of communication with the West, as a means of checking the rapid decline of commercial enterprise resulting from the falling price of cotton. Late in 1827 they obtained from the legislature a charter for the South Carolina Canal and Railroad Company which was authorized to construct a road from Charleston to the Savannah River at Hamburg, just across the river from Augusta. Begun in 1830, this road was completed in 1833, and was for the time-being the longest railroad in the world. Not satisfied with this impressive accomplishment, the officers of the company had already initiated plans for the extension of their line farther into the West.[13]

These plans were inspired, at least in part, by suggestions made by an eminent Knoxville physician and historian, Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey, who seems to have been the first in East Tennessee to envision the possibilities of rail communication with the Atlantic seaboard. In March, 1828, while delivering an address of welcome to the captain and crew of the *Atlas,* the first steam-boat to pass over Muscle Shoals and ascend the river to Knoxville, he rather tactless-

10 *Priv. Acts,* 1831, pp. 157-72; *H. Jr.,* 1831, p. 314 (Dec. 10).
11 *Rail-Road Advocate,* Mar. 27, May 1, 1832.
12 *Ibid.,* Apr. 19, 1832.
13 U. B. Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt* to 1860 (New York, 1908), 132-69; S. M. Derrick, *Centennial History of South Carolina Railroad* (Columbia, S. C., 1930), 1-70.

ly declared that the true interests of East Tennessee could best be promoted, not by the improvement of the Tennessee River, but by the establishment of "land communication" with the Atlantic Coast at Charleston or Savannah. Steamboat navigation on the upper Tennessee, he contended, would subject the farmers and manufacturers of this section of the state to the ruinous competition of the more fertile lands and more highly developed industries of the upper Mississippi Valley. A connection with the seaboard, on the other hand, would provide a more direct access to the foreign market, and also make possible the obtaining of imports by the same route.[14] Later in the same year he visited Charleston and endeavored to convince the projectors of the South Carolina Railroad that it would be to their advantage to extend their line to the Tennessee River; and while there he contributed several articles to the *Charleston Mercury* in advocacy of this plan. Some of these articles were reprinted in the *Knoxville Register.*[15]

The Ramsey proposal, derisively dubbed "Mecklenburg Politics", for some time received little attention in East Tennessee, where the arrival of the *Atlas* had excited hopes that a new day was dawning in the economic development of the section.[16] A few years later, however, when it was known that the Charleston and Hamburg road was actually in successful operation over a part of the route, the possibility of its being extended to the Tennessee was exciting considerable interest. In June, 1831, two representatives of the South Carolina Railroad Company attended a convention at Knoxville, at which resolutions were adopted promising "strenuous cooperation" on the part of the citizens of East Tennessee in the accomplishment of this object. A large committee was appointed to collect statistical information; and a central committee of three, headed by Dr. Ramsey, was requested to secure from the War Department a copy of the survey made by United States engineers between the Savannah and Tennessee rivers, and also to draft a memorial to the Tennessee legislature.[17]

This central committee reported in September that the survey made by United States engineers clearly demonstrated the practicability of a railroad from the Savannah River at Augusta to the valley of the Little Tennessee; but they suggested as an alternative a route across the state of North Carolina and over the mountains along

[14] J. G. M. Ramsey, Autobiography, 18-19; *Knoxville Register,* Mar. 12, 1828.
[15] *Ibid.,* Feb. 4, 11, 1829; Ramsey, 20.
[16] *Ibid.* Mecklenburg was the name given to Ramsey's private mansion.
[17] *Knoxville Register,* June 15, 1831.

the valley of the French Broad River.[18] On the basis of these conclusions, they drafted a memorial to the legislature which resulted in the incorporation, on December 17, 1831, of the Knoxville and Southern Railroad Company. This company was authorized to construct a road from some point on the Tennessee River admitting of steamboat navigation to the southern boundary of the state, and to unite, for the purpose of effecting a connection with the South Carolina Railroad, with any company incorporated by Georgia, North Carolina, or South Carolina.[19]

Since one of the two routes under construction lay across North Carolina, the people of that state became interested. Consequently, on September 4, 1832, a convention of delegates assembled at Asheville, in which four counties of Tennessee and three of North Carolina were represented. Mitchell King, of Charleston, presided. Resolutions were adopted affirming the practicability of the French Broad route; committees of correspondence were appointed for each of the three states concerned; and measures were taken to secure a preliminary survey of the route by United States engineers. In response to the request of Mr. King, Colonel Stephen H. Long was detailed for this service. The South Carolina legislature appropriated $1,000 as its share of the expense involved, and the Tennessee legislature appropriated $500; but since both appropriations were made dependent upon similar action by North Carolina, and this state failed to make any appropriation, nothing further was done.[20]

For some time after the Asheville convention the excitement in South Carolina caused by the nullification controversy, and the preoccupation of East Tennessee with plans for river improvement resulted in a rapid decline of public interest in this railroad enterprise. In 1835, however, the movement was revived in the even more expansive form of a proposal that a railroad be built from the Ohio River to Charleston, the initiative this time being taken by citizens of Cincinnati.[21] Under the brilliant leadership of Robert Y. Hayne, the people of Charleston enthusiastically endorsed the idea; and in December, 1835, the legislature of South Carolina granted a charter of incorporation, and appropriated $10,000 to finance a preliminary survey. Within the course of a few months the company

[18] *Ibid.*, Sept. 14, 1831; 22 Cong., 1 Sess., *H. ex. doc.* No. 104.

[19] *Priv. Acts*, 1831, pp 232. The memorial was printed in *Knoxville Register*, Dec. 28, 1831.

[20] *Knoxville Register*, Sept. 12, 1832; Derrick, *op. cit.*, 129-131; Phillips, *op. cit.*, 169-70; Ramsey, *op. cit.*, 26; *Priv. Acts* (Tennessee), 1833, p. 47.

[21] *Rail-Road from the Banks of the Ohio River to the Tide Waters of the Carolinas and Georgia* (Cincinnati, 1835). Pamphlet in Tenn. State Library.

was incorporated in the states of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and a group of South Carolina commissioners were busily engaged in examining the mountain passes through the Appalachian barrier.[22]

Meanwhile, interest was rapidly developing throughout East Tennessee, and considerable rivalry was manifested over the location of the route. Most prominent in public favor was a route entering Tennessee through the French Broad Valley, as already approved by the Asheville Convention, and after passing in the vicinity of Knoxville, going out through Cumberland Gap into Kentucky. The people of the upper counties, however, hoped that the road would pass directly through upper East Tennessee; and Thomas A. R. Nelson, in a letter to Hayne, emphasized the shortness of this route. He argued furthermore that Carter county alone, if provided with transportation facilities, could manufacture enough iron to supply the whole United States.[23] The people of the lower counties, on the other hand, were already making plans to effect a connection with a railroad being projected in Georgia, which was to run from Augusta, opposite the terminus of the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad, through Athens, Georgia, to the Tennessee River, or to an even more western terminus on the Mississippi, at Memphis.[24] A meeting of citizens at Philadelphia, Tennessee, in December, 1835, petitioned the legislature for a charter; and the General Assembly in February, 1836, in response to this petition, incorporated the Hiwassee Railroad Company, giving it authority to construct a road from Knoxville or Blair's Ferry (now Loudon) to the southern boundary of the state, and to unite with the Augusta-Memphis line.[25] The interest of these lower East Tennesseans in the Cincinnati and Charleston project was therefore joined with the hope that a route might be selected which would pass around the southern end of the mountain barrier and make their road a link in the great chain.

Interest was further developed by the assembling in Knoxville on July 4, 1836, of a mammoth convention of some four hundred delegates representing nine states. Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina presided. The commissioners who conducted the preliminary survey presented their report, in which they pronounced the project feasible,

[22] Derrick, 131-47; *Priv. Acts* (Tennessee), 1835-6, pp. 1-4 (Jan. 21, 1836). The Kentucky Charter insisted upon the construction of branches to Louisville and Maysville; and the name of the company was therefore changed to the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston Railroad Company.

[23] Apr. 18, 1836, Nelson Papers (McClung Collection, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tenn.).

[24] Phillips, 221-3, 301-6.

[25] Tenn. Archives; *Priv. Acts,* 1835-6, pp. 23-31.

and estimated the cost at approximately $12,000,000. On the basis of this report the convention adopted the French Broad route, but made provision for a branch line through Georgia in an effort to conciliate the delegation from that state. The convention closed on July 8 with a barbecue given by the citizens of Knoxville, at which President Hayne closed a brilliant address with the following toast: "The South and the West.—We have published the banns—if any man know aught why these should not be joined together, let him speak now, or forever hold his peace." Thus the railroad enterprise was well launched.[26]

The delegates from Georgia, however, were greatly disappointed by their failure to secure action at the convention which would bring the main line of the road through their state. The delegates from lower East Tennessee, particularly from McMinn county, were also dissatisfied; and it is said that they called the attention of the Georgia delegation to the existence of the Hiwassee Railroad charter, and received instructions to proceed with the opening of subscription books, and a promise on the part of the Georgians to build a road to meet them at the state line. Thus the Hiwassee Railroad project, which seems to have been submerged in the general excitement relative to the Knoxville convention, was suddenly revived; and the subscription books, which were to have been opened on July 4, were somewhat tardily placed before the public.[27]

The initiation of these two railroad enterprises in East Tennessee was also very intimately connected with the adoption by the state of a general system of state aid to internal improvements at the legislative session of 1835-6. In October, 1835, a meeting of citizens of Washington county at Jonesboro drafted a fervent memorial to the legislature to which some six hundred signatures were attached. The memorialists expressed a "deep conviction that the period had at length arrived when the honor, no less than the best interests of Tennessee, imperiously demand that her Gov't. should commence and vigorously prosecute a system of Internal Improvements upon a scale commensurate with her credit and resources." They viewed with "deep and painful mortification" the enlightened spirit at work in younger states while Tennessee "remained in a state of inglorious inaction." They referred specifically to the fact that East Tennessee

26 *Proceedings of the Knoxville Convention, in Relation to the Proposed Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston Railroad, Assembled at Knoxville, Tennessee, July* 4th, 1836 (Knoxville, 1836). See also *Knoxville Register*, July 13, 1836; Niles Register, LI, 44 ff.; Derrick, 148-51; Phillips, 182-4.

27 J. B. Killebrew and J. M. Safford, *Introduction to the Resources of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1874), 311; *Knoxville Register*, July 13, 1836.

was most grievously oppressed by the want of commercial facilities, and directed attention to the proposed Cincinnati and Charleston Railroad as a means of adding to the wealth and resources of this section alone a sum far exceeding the whole cost of its construction. They closed with an earnest solicitation that the legislature act in concert with the other states in rendering financial assistance in the accomplishment of the work, pledging the credit of the state, if necessary, to secure the funds.[28]

These sentiments were enthusiastically echoed at numerous other meetings held at various points throughout East Tennessee; and the editor of the Nashville Republican was led to comment: "A loud voice has come from the hills and valleys of East Tennessee, upon the subject of Internal Improvements, which we trust will find a response among the liberal and enlightened citizens of every other part of the State."[29] In fact, interest in internal improvements was becoming general throughout Tennessee at this time, since a number of railroads and turnpikes were being projected in the other sections. In response to this general demand, and to the earnest recommendation of Governor Cannon, the legislature in February, 1836, enacted a law authorizing the governor on behalf of the state to subscribe for one third of the stock in all railroad and macadamized turnpike companies incorporated by the General Assembly. Only three East Tennessee votes were cast against this bill; and it was generally recognized that the vigorous and united stand taken by the representatives from this section, under the leadership of Addison A. Anderson and George W. Churchwell, was a decisive factor in securing the adoption of the measure.[30]

According to the provisions of this law the aid of the state was not to be available to any company until the remaining two thirds of the stock had been taken by individual subscribers, and in the opinion of the Governor, Treasurer, and Secretary of State was "well secured". The projectors of the two East Tennessee railroads, therefore, although much encouraged, still had a difficult problem confronting them, if the essential aid of the state was to materialize. The scarcity of liquid capital in the undeveloped section of East Tennessee was soon to prove a difficult obstacle to surmount. To secure the adoption of enthusiastic resolutions in favor of the con-

[28] Tenn. Archives.

[29] Jan. 30, 1836.

[30] *H. Jr.*, 1835-6, p. 108; *Nashville Republican*, Feb. 13, 16, 1836; *Knoxville Register*, Mar. 13, 1836. The act was passed by a union of forces of East and West Tennessee over the opposition of Middle Tennessee. The two parties were divided rather evenly on the question.

struction of a railroad was comparatively easy; but to induce poor and struggling farmers and merchants to invest their hard-earned savings in what was at best a precarious undertaking was an entirely different proposition.

The early efforts to obtain the necessary two-thirds subscriptions were disappointing. Subscription books were opened by the commissioners for the Hiwassee Railroad Company early in July, 1836; but several months later, when only a few days remained in which to obtain the subscription of the $400,000 necessary to avoid the forfeiture of the charter, it was found that only about $120,000 had been subscribed. Accordingly, six railroad enthusiasts of McMinn county agreed among themselves to make up the deficit, with the understanding, however, that they would not permit the organization of the company until they had been able to dispose of enough of their stock to enable them to meet the calls for payment on what they retained.[31] By April, 1837, the stock had been sufficiently distributed to permit an organization; a board of directors under the presidency of Solomon D. Jacobs was then elected, and advertisements were made for the grading of the portion of the road lying between the Hiwassee and Tennessee rivers.[32]

Since the subscription of $400,000 also represented two-thirds of the capital stock, the company immediately made application to the governor for the state bonds in payment of the state subscription. Governor Cannon, however, replied that he had no means of judging the solvency of the individual subscribers, and therefore insisted that he could not consider these subscriptions to be "well secured", unless the company would execute a bond guaranteeing their payment. He suggested as another alternative that the presentation of evidence that a third or a fourth of the amount subscribed had actually been paid in would be considered as sufficient security to justify the issuance of the state bonds. He enclosed an opinion of the Attorney General justifying his interpretation of the law.[33] The large amounts of stock still in the hands of the six McMinn county subscribers, however, rendered it impossible for the company to adopt either of the alternatives suggested by the governor; and the state subscription, therefore, was not forthcoming. Nevertheless, the work of surveying was continued by Chief Engineer Trautwine; the contract for grading the 41½ mile span between the Hiwassee and Tennessee rivers was let to an Irish contractor by the name of

31 Killebrew and Safford, *op. cit.*, 311.
32 *Knoxville Register*, April 26, July 26, 1837.
33 Cannon to Jacobs, May 25, 1837, in *ibid.*, June 7, 1837.

Kennedy Lonergan on June 4; and the work of construction was actually begun during the latter part of August, 1837. Thus the Hiwassee Railroad Company attained the honor of being the first to break ground in the construction of a railroad in the state of Tennessee.[34]

Even less success in the efforts to achieve eligibility for the state subscription was attained by the projectors of the railroad from Cincinnati to Charleston. Shortly after the Knoxville convention Robert Y. Hayne issued an address to the people explaining the significance of the project and asking general support; and in October subscription books were opened in all five of the states concerned. The East Tennessee newspapers supported the project enthusiastically, and printed numerous excerpts from the Charleston and Cincinnati press, in which rosy pictures were painted of the advantages to be derived from the construction of the road.[35] Nevertheless, when the commissioners assembled in Knoxville in November to ascertain the number of shares subscribed, it was revealed that outside of South Carolina the response was very disappointing. Although East Tennesseans had subscribed a total of $355,400, which greatly exceeded the subscriptions in any other state except South Carolina, this sum represented only a small portion of two-thirds of the estimated cost of construction in Tennessee, which would be necessary to make the company eligible for the state subscription. As a result of the especially generous response from citizens of South Carolina, however, the goal of $4,000,000 necessary to permit the organization of the company was attained; and the first meeting of the stockholders was held in January, 1837. A board of directors was chosen, and Robert Y. Hayne elected to guide the destinies of the company as its president.[36]

The failure of both of these railroad enterprises to qualify under the provisions of the state aid law of 1836 made it evident that unless the system should be made more liberal no benefits could be derived from it in East Tennessee. Furthermore, the breaking upon the country of a serious financial panic in 1837 greatly increased the difficulties of these companies, and rendered an increase in the amount of state aid even more essential if there was to be any hope of success. The adoption by Congress in June, 1836, however, of the policy of distributing the surplus revenue among the states pre-

[34] *Knoxville Register,* July 26, Aug. 30, 1837; Killebrew and Safford, 311.
[35] See especially *Tennessee Farmer* (Jonesborough), November, 1837.
[36] Derrick 154, 160; *Proceedings of the First Meeting of the Stockholders of of the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston Rail-Road Company, held in Knoxville, on the* 9th *of January,* 1837.

sented an effective argument in favor of a greater measure of liberality on the part of the legislature.[37] Each of the East Tennessee companies, therefore, made plans to present its case aggressively before the General Assembly of 1837-8.

The directors of the Hiwassee company drafted an eloquent memorial to the legislature, in which they vigorously criticized the interpretation which the Governor had placed upon the act of 1836, and insisted that they were particularly deserving of relief in view of the serious delays occasioned by their failure to receive the state bonds to which they claimed they were entitled. They urged that the state subscription be increased from one-third to one-half, and suggested that this would be an excellent policy to be adopted as a general one for the state.[38]

Meanwhile, the officials of the Charleston company were attempting to salvage their railroad enterprise by associating with it a bank of large proportions and extensive privileges. In December, 1836, the South Carolina legislature passed an act authorizing the railroad company to establish a separate corporation for banking purposes, under the name of the Southwestern Railroad Bank. Since no one was to be permitted to become a stockholder in the bank who was not a stockholder to an equal amount in the railroad, it was expected that the value of the railroad shares would be correspondingly increased. Not only would the bank dividends provide an excellent source of funds for the building of the road, but they would also reconcile the stockholders to the necessary delays in the receipt of dividends on the railroad stock.[39]

The bank charter was not to go into effect, however, until it had been concurred in by at least two other states, and the subscriptions of stock in the railroad company increased to $8,000,000. The North Carolina legislature incorporated the bank in January, 1837;[40] and Robert Y. Hayne appeared in person before the General As-

[37] An unsuccessful effort was made during the special session of 1836 to secure an appropriation of Tennessee's share of this fund (the amount actually received was $1,433,757.39) in aid of internal improvements; but with the exception of $15,000 appropriated for the survey of a Central railroad, and $2,500 for Tennessee's share of the expenses incurred in the preliminary survey of the Cincinnati and Charleston route, it was deposited in Nashville and Memphis banks. *Pub. Acts,* 1836, pp. 9-14. This question became a major issue in the state campaign of 1837.

[38] *H. Jr., App.,* 1837-8, pp. 762-77. Included in the memorial was a table showing in itemized form the anticipated receipts from traffic on the road, on the basis of which it was concluded that the profits of the company would be at least 15% on the estimated cost of construction.

[39] Phillips, 189-91; Derrick, 156-8.

[40] *Ibid.,* 158.

sembly of 1837-8 to obtain similar action from the state of Tennessee. His eloquence was convincing and the legislature responded with an endorsement of the bank charter on December 5, 1837.[41] The news of the passage of this bill was received in East Tennessee with great rejoicing; and on the evening of December 11, according to the editor of the *Register,* the whole populace of Knoxville participated in a "common demonstration of joy," which was marked by a salute of fifty-six guns, the ringing of bells, the building of bonfires, and pyrotechnic displays.[42]

In his address before the legislature, and in the memorial which he presented on behalf of his company, President Hayne had joined his request for the grant of banking privileges with an earnest solicitation that the Tennessee subscription to the stock of the railroad company be increased to $1,000,000. His success with regard to the first part of his mission was taken as an indication that he would be at least partially successful in the second part also. Upon his return to South Carolina, he used the assurance which he was able to give that the "support of Tennessee was now certain" as a means of securing additional aid from the South Carolina legislature. He immediately wrote to a member of the Tennessee legislature, stating that the success of the project was now all the more dependent "on the million to be subscribed by Tennessee", since it was necessary to have $8,000,000 subscribed by the end of the month in order to save the charter of the bank, and that all but $700,000 of this amount had been obtained.

This letter arrived in Nashville almost simultaneously with the final vote in the House on the Bank and Improvement Act of 1838, which increased the proportion of the state's subscription to the stock of internal improvement companies from one-third to one-half. Not only the influence of Hayne, but also the almost unanimous support given the measure by the representatives of East Tennessee aided materially in overcoming the opposition of Middle Tennessee and securing its adoption. The act was also the result of a consummate system of log-rolling which attempted to reconcile all the divergent sectional interests, to satisfy the advocates of rail, river, and turnpike transportation, and to secure the support of the elements in favor of the establishment of a state bank and a state

---

[41] *H. Jr., App.,* 1937-8, pp. 836-58; *H. Jr.,* and *Sen. Jr.,* Nov 22, 23, 1837; Acts, 1837-8, p. 36; *Nashville Republican,* Nov. 23, 24, 1837. See also T. D. Jervey, *Robert Y. Hayne and his Times* (New York, 1909), p. 447 and *passim.*

[42] *Knoxville Register,* Dec. 13, 1837.

[43] Copied from the *Nashville Banner* in the *Knoxville Register,* Jan. 3, 1838. The letter was dated Columbia, Dec. 18, 1837.

system of education. All these varied interests were combined in one elaborate measure.[44]

It is indicative of the overpowering interest of East Tennessee in railroad construction that its delegation in the legislature decided to place practically the whole of East Tennessee's share of the $4,000,000 appropriated in aid of internal improvements at the disposal of the two East Tennessee railroad enterprises. The sum of $650,000 was to be subscribed to each company; $100,000 was to be applied to river improvement; and a provision was included to the effect that if either railroad failed to qualify for its subscription, this amount was to be available for turnpike companies in East Tennessee.[45]

The people of this section, however, were not entirely satisfied with this arrangement. The appropriation of the same amount for the Hiwassee Railroad as for the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston company was especially subject to criticism; and the Hiwassee project immediately became the target of a bitter attack by the supporters of the Charleston enterprise, who were joined by the friends of the river and turnpike interests of East Tennessee. The fact that the Western and Atlantic Railroad of Georgia had determined to seek a terminus of its own on the Tennessee River at Ross Landing (now Chattanooga) rather than content itself with a connection with the Hiwassee, was seized upon as justification for this attack. It was argued that this would not only necessitate an extension of the Hiwassee road for at least six miles into the state of Georgia to enable it to effect a junction with the Georgia system, but that it would limit the use of the road to import trade. Exports would naturally be carried on down the river to Ross Landing, and transferred to the railroad at that point. The controversy was also characterized by the development of rivalry between Athens, the center of the Hiwassee Railroad influence, and Knoxville. The Athens newspapers charged that the opposition of Knoxvillians to the Hiwassee project was dictated by their fears that the construction of the road would endanger Knoxville's position of dominance in East Tennessee.[46]

The influence of this adverse criticism is indicated by the fact that within ten days after the General Assembly had authorized the

[44] *H. Jr.*, 1837-8, Dec. 22, 1837; *Sen. Jr.*, 1837-8, Jan. 3, 11, 1838; *Acts*, 1837-8, pp. 153-66; *Knoxville Register*, Dec. 27, 1837.

[45] For a vivid description of the log-rolling procedure, especially with reference to East Tennessee, see letter of A. O. P. Nicholson, the chief sponsor of the bill in the House, to the editor of the *Knoxville Register*, Jan. 8, 1838, in *ibid.*, Jan. 17, 1838.

[46] *Knoxville Register*, Jan. 17, 31, Feb. 7, 8, 14. 1838.

$650,000 subscription to the stock of the Hiwassee Railroad, it passed an act giving this company permission to construct a turnpike instead of a railroad along the route. With a view to carrying out this design a special meeting of the stockholders was called through the influence of Major Thomas Brown, of Kingston; but the turnpike proposal was overwhelmingly rejected, and a general desire was expressed for the rapid and vigorous prosecution of the enterprise as a railroad.[47] The work of construction was therefore pushed forward steadily, and by November, 1839, the president was able to report that the grading of fifty-two miles had been completed, and that twenty miles more would be ready for the rails by January 1. Suggestions were even being made of an extension of the road to the Virginia line.[48]

This progress was not made, however, without surmounting serious obstacles. The severity of the economic depression made it very difficult indeed to collect the installments on the private subscriptions; and since according to the state aid law of 1838 no payments on the state subscription could be made until fifteen per cent had actually been paid in by the individual subscribers, the aid of the state was not available until near the close of that year. On November 1, however, the first installment of $97,000 in bonds was issued by the governor; but such was the condition of the market that they could not be sold except at a ruinous sacrifice. They were therefore used as security for a loan, but were later disposed of at from 73 to 77 cents on the dollar. After a repetition of a process closely resembling the extraction of teeth, a second installment of fifteen per cent was collected from the individual subscribers; and a second lot of $98,000 in bonds was issued by the governor on September 10, 1839. These bonds were retained for ninety days by the state bank, however, in an unsuccessful attempt to dispose of them at par; and in the meantime, the company was faced with the prospect of bankruptcy.[49] In December, 1839, Kennedy Lonergan, the chief contractor, wrote to Governor Polk that there was "Not one Dollar on the Whole Works," and stated that it had been necessary for the farmers and merchants in the vicinity to turn

[47] *Acts,* 1837-8, p. 258 (Jan. 27, 1838); *Knoxville Register,* Apr. 4, May 9, 1838.

[48] "Report of the President and Directors of the Hiwassee Railroad Company in answer to a Resolution of the General Assembly", Nov. 15, 1839, Tenn. Archives; *Elizabethton Whig,* Oct. 3, 1839.

[49] S. D. Jacobs to Gov. Cannon, Sept. 11, 1838, Governors' Papers (Tenn. State Library); *Sen. Jr.,* 1839-40, pp. 142-4; *H. Jr., App.,* 1839-40, pp. 896-7; *H. Jr., App.,* 1841-2, p. 157; *Knoxville Times,* Sept. 17, 1839.

out and supply the laborers with food in order to keep the work of construction going.[50]

It was evident, therefore, that additional aid from the state was imperative. The directors of the company, however, planned as a first resort to take advantage of the even more serious difficulties in which the Cincinnati and Charleston project had become involved, and attempt to effect a consolidation with that company. By this measure they expected to secure not only a transfer to their road of a large part of the state subscription to the Charleston company but also to obtain all the advantages of the Southwestern Railroad Bank. Before taking up the subject of this proposed consolidation it will be necessary, however, to review briefly the history of the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad during this period.

Following the favorable action of the Tennessee General Assembly of 1837-8, the friends of this enterprise in East Tennessee were very much encouraged; and meetings of the East Tennessee stockholders were held in Knoxville in advocacy of immediate commencement of the work on the Tennessee section. On January 21, 1839, Governor Cannon issued $32,000 in bonds in part payment of the Tennessee subscription, in order to provide the funds for the final survey and location of this part of the route.[51] The grant of banking privileges resulted in a rapid increase in the subscription list; and it was possible to put the Knoxville branch of the Southwestern Railroad Bank in operation in February, 1839. Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey was elected president, and so ably did he administer its affairs that this bank was one of the few in the South and West which did not suspend specie payments during the recurrence of the financial crisis in 1839.[52]

It was this unfavorable financial situation, however, which was largely responsible for the disappointment of the people of East Tennessee in regard to their hopes of seeing the road under construction in their own state. The serious decline in the price of cotton made it almost impossible for the South Carolina subscribers to make the payments on their subscriptions. The state of the money market made it equally impossible to dispose of state securities.

[50] Dec. 11, 1839, Papers of James K. Polk, First Series, XLI. (Mss. in Library of Congress).

[51] *Knoxville Register,* Mar. 21, July 11, Aug. 15, 1838; *H. Jr., App.,* 1839-40, pp. 896-7. Pres. Hayne prepared an address to the East Tennessee stockholders in which he presented in tabular form an estimate of the remarkable savings the people of East Tennessee would be able to make by means of railroad transportation on the import trade alone, *ibid.,* Apr. 4, 1838.

[52] *Ibid.,* Jan. 23, Feb. 20, 1839; Ramsey to Polk, Dec. 18, 1839, Polk Papers, First Series, XLII.

The company, therefore, laboring under a heavy load of debt caused by the purchase and repair of the South Carolina Railroad, was in no position to undertake the difficult and expensive task of piercing the mountain barrier, particularly in view of the failure of North Carolina to grant any effectual aid to the enterprise. Consequently, the stockholders decided in September, 1839, to concentrate for the present upon meeting the obligations of the company, and completing the branch to Columbia.[53]

Moreover, the acquisition of the Charleston and Hamburg road had given the company an opportunity to gain access to the West in another direction. From Augusta, opposite the western terminus of this line, the citizens and the state of Georgia were making rapid progress in the construction of a series of railroads extending to Chattanooga, on the Tennessee River; and were expecting to attain a connection by rail and river with the thriving town of Memphis on the Mississippi. Furthermore, the completion of the Hiwassee Railroad would provide this Georgia system with direct access to Knoxville. Since rail communication already existed along this route to a point nearly 250 miles from Charleston, the trade of East Tennessee was beginning to turn in this direction; and Charleston merchants were advertising in the Knoxville newspapers. In view of the failure of Kentucky to grant any assistance whatever to the Cincinnati and Charleston enterprise, the company no longer had any intention of extending this road beyond Knoxville; and many South Carolinians considered it ridiculous to build two roads between Charleston and Knoxville.[54]

Nevertheless, Robert Y. Hayne still hung tenaciously to his original design of constructing a railroad directly over the mountains, and the East Tennessee friends of this enterprise refused to give up hope as long as he remained at the head of the company. With the death of Hayne, however, in September, 1839, even Dr. Ramsey despaired of seeing a railroad enter Tennessee along the French Broad valley.[55] In view of the imminent abandonment of the railroad project upon which the charter in Tennessee of the Southwestern Railroad Bank depended, it behooved the directors of

[53] *Proceedings of the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston Railroad Company,* 1839; See also Derrick, 168-173.

[54] Phillips, *op. cit.,* chs. 5 and 7; *Knoxville Times,* Sept. 13, 1839; *Knoxville Register,* Feb. 6, 20, 27, 1839; *Nashville Whig,* June 21, 1839. See also, Derrick, 177, and Jervey *op. cit., passim.*

[55] Ramsey to Polk, Sept. 26, 1839, Polk Papers, First Series, XL. Meanwhile, the Tennessee directors of the railroad company had come to the decision that no Tennessee funds should be expended on the undertaking until the road reached the Tennessee line, Ramsey to Polk, Dec. 18, 1839, *ibid.,* XLII.

the Knoxville branch of this institution to take steps for the preservation of their corporate rights. It was this situation which led them to give some consideration to the idea of effecting a consolidation of their railroad company with the Hiwassee enterprise.

The first public suggestion of this plan seems to have been made in editorial columns of the *Knoxville Times*[56] early in October, 1839. On October 26 a meeting of citizens in Knoxville, called by John C. Trautwine, Chief Engineer of the Hiwassee Railroad Company, appointed a "mediatorial committee" of five to enter into correspondence with the boards of directors of the two companies regarding the terms of union. The question was referred to a committee of Tennessee directors by the stockholders of the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad Company at a meeting held on December 4; but the officials of the Hiwassee Railroad, unwilling to await action on the part of the other company, had already drafted a bill providing the consolidation, and it was introduced in the Tennessee General Assembly on December 7 by Solomon D. Jacobs, President of the Hiwassee Railroad, and a member of the lower house. This bill provided for the transfer to the Hiwassee project of $450,000 of the state subscription to the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad. The remainder of this subscription was to be subscribed to a turnpike company authorized to construct a turnpike from Knoxville to the Virginia line. The Hiwassee stockholders were to be allowed to take stock in the Southwestern Railroad Bank, and the capitalization of this institution, and also of the railroad company, was to be proportionately increased.[57]

It was a very inopportune time, however, to present such a measure before the legislature. The failure of the Bank and Improvement Act of 1838 to achieve the beneficent results expected had resulted in a sudden turn of public sentiment against the system of state aid; and this same session of the General Assembly repealed by an overwhelming majority all laws authorizing subscriptions on behalf of the state to the stock of internal improvement companies.[58] Furthermore, even the East Tennessee delegation failed to take a united stand in favor of the measure. The powerful river interests refused to support the bill because it failed to set aside any part of the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston appropriation for river improvement. There were also many supporters of the Cincinnati and

[56] Oct. 4, 1839.

[57] *Knoxville Times,* Oct. 25, 29, Dec. 13, 1839; Ramsey to Polk, Dec. 18, 1839, *loc. cit.; H. Jr.,* 1839-40, p. 467 (Dec. 7).

[58] *Acts,* 1839-40, pp. 1-7 (Jan. 25, 1840). The act, however, did not repeal any subscriptions already made.

Charleston enterprise who still hoped that the French Broad route would not be permanently abandoned. Finally, an announcement by the governor of Georgia that work on the Western and Atlantic road was certain to be suspended came as a serious blow to the Hiwassee enterprise.[59]

The most important influence leading to the defeat of the consolidation measure, however, was the fact that it had been drafted and introduced by the officials of the Hiwassee Railroad Company, all of whom were members of the Whig party. It was naturally viewed with suspicion by East Tennessee Democrats, who considered it a Whig maneuver designed to increase political influence of that party in the eastern part of the state by obtaining for it the control of the Southwestern Railroad Bank. Both Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey and Alexander Anderson of Knoxville wrote to Governor Polk that if passed as drafted it would seal the doom of the Democratic party in East Tennessee and create a political "life estate" in favor of the Whigs. Dr. Ramsey expressed the opinion, confidentially, that it was the design of the Whigs to depose him from his position as president of the bank because his currency sentiments and banking and political principles had "given offence in high places". He also argued that to consolidate the two roads "by legislation", prior to the action to be taken by the stockholders of the Charleston company at their regular meeting the following December, would be an act of bad faith to the states of North and South Carolina, and would be unjust to the people of upper East Tennessee.[60]

As a result of these adverse influences, and because of the inability of the various interests involved to work out an acceptable compromise, the bill was decisively defeated on January 25 by a vote of 26 to 38.[61] The plans for consolidation were therefore dropped; and when the affairs of the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad Company failed to show improvement, its stockholders decided in December, 1840, to abandon definitely their plans of constructing a railroad over the mountains. They proposed to release the state of Tennessee from its subscription and to return the $32,000 in bonds, provided the state would agree to pay its rateable proportion of the expenses incurred in surveying the route beyond the borders of South Carolina. Governor Polk submitted this offer to the legislature along with his message of October 7, 1841, and recommended its acceptance. The incoming governor, James C.

[59] *Knoxville Times*, Nov. 8, Dec. 27, 1839; *H. Jr.*, 1839-40, Jan. 13, 25, 1840.
[60] Anderson to Polk, Dec. 21, 1839, Ramsey to Polk, Dec. 18, 1839, Polk Papers, First Series, XLII.
[61] *H. Jr.*, 1839-40, p. 567.

Jones, recommended more specifically that the General Assembly determine what disposition should be made of the appropriation to the Charleston company, but suggested that "a highly useful and profitable investment" might be made of it in the eastern part of the state.[62]

This suggestion met with vigorous opposition, however, from the representatives of Middle Tennessee, who insisted that the subscription be completely cancelled, and no re-assignment of it made, arguing that this would materially decrease the prospective debt of the state and lessen the danger of increased taxation or repudiation, which they claimed to be imminent. They contended that East Tennessee, in the subscription of $650,000 to the Hiwassee Railroad, had already received state aid to an amount greatly exceeding what was justified by its relative proportion of taxable property. The East Tennesseans replied with the charge that citizens of Middle Tennessee, by methods of outright fraud against the state, had succeeded in obtaining the lion's share of the bonds actually issued, and had used them in the construction of an excellent system of turnpikes. They argued that it was very selfish on the part of Middle Tennesseans, after having monopolized all the benefits of the state aid system, to seek to deprive East Tennessee of its just share of the appropriations made by the sacred compromise of 1838.[63] So great was the resentment developed in East Tennessee that a movement was initiated in favor of the separation of this section from the rest of the state.[64]

The chief obstacle in the way of obtaining a re-assignment of the appropriation, however, was the inability of the people of East Tennessee to agree among themselves as to how this aid should be distributed among the various internal improvement interests in their section. The Hiwassee Railroad naturally insisted that it was entitled to the larger portion of this subscription, pointing out that the purpose of this enterprise was the accomplishment of the same design expected to be attained by the original appropriation—that is, the establishment of rail communication between East Tennessee and Charleston. The steamboat interests of Knoxville, however,

[62] *H. Jr.*, 1841-2, pp. 19, 94.

[63] *Sen. Jr.*, 1841-2, pp. 357-8, 420-1; *Nashville Whig*, Dec. 1841, Jan. 1842, *passim*.

[64] A resolution providing for this separation, introduced by Andrew Johnson, was actually adopted in the Senate, *Sen. Jr.*, Dec. 6, 1841, Jan. 18, 1842. Although several factors combined to induce this desire for separation, the proceedings of meetings and editorial comments in East Tennessee show that the internal improvement controversy was one of the most important. See particularly, *Jonesborough Whig*, Dec. 15, 1841, Aug. 24, 1842.

argued with equal stubbornness that a large part of the funds available be used in completing the removal of the obstructions in the river between that city and the Georgia line. The people of the upper counties, who had lost much of their interest in railroads with the collapse of the Cincinnati and Charleston enterprise, were equally insistent that the whole of the appropriation should be applied to the improvement of the navigation of the rivers east of Knoxville, or the construction of a system of macadamized roads. Finally, Dr. Ramsey headed a vigorous movement in favor of using the money for the establishment of another bank in East Tennessee to replace the Southwestern Railroad Bank which was in the process of gradual liquidation as a result of the abandonment of the railroad project upon which its charter depended.[65]

Thus a veritable free-for-all fight developed over the prostrate form of the Cincinnati and Charleston railroad enterprise for the right to inherit its appropriation. The result was a deadlock in the legislature which prevented any action being taken during the regular session of 1841-2. The same struggle recurred during the special session of 1842; and not until an immediate decision on the question was made necessary by the filing of a suit against the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston Railroad Company did the East Tennessee delegation reach any semblance of agreement. But it was then too late. The opposition forces, especially of Middle Tennessee, were too well organized; and the act which was passed during this session merely provided for cancellation of the subscription, and the return of the bonds which had been issued, upon the payment to the company of whatever amount the court should decide to be Tennessee's shart of the expenses for surveys. Thus the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston appropriation was lost to East Tennessee.[66]

Meanwhile, the Hiwassee Railroad Company was struggling along on the verge of bankruptcy, buoyed up chiefly by the hope of inheriting at least a part of the Cincinnati and Charleston subscription. Realizing that it would be suicidal to allow the work to be suspended during this critical period, the company adopted many and varied expedients in its efforts to keep the work going, some of which had disastrous consequences. The slowness with which payments on

[65] *Sen. Jr.*, 1841-2, pp. 376-85; *Jonesboro Whig*, Nov. 10, 1841, Jan. 5, 1842; *Nashville Whig*, Dec., 1841, Jan., Oct., 1842, *passim*; J. G. M. Ramsey, Contributions to the Political, Secular and Religious Press, 104-5 (Scrap-book in McClung Collection, Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville).

[66] *H. Jr.*, 1841-2, pp. 79, 733, 749-51; *Sen. Jr.*, 1842, pp. 8 (Message of Gov. Jones), 77-8; *H. Jr.*, 1842, pp. 102-3; *Acts*, 1842, p. 27.

the individual subscriptions were paid resulted in a corresponding delay in obtaining installments on the state subscription; and the directors seem to have yielded to the temptation to allow unnecessarily large credits to certain subscribers in payment for rights-of-way or for work done on the road.[67] By May, 1841, $357,000 in bonds had been received, but it was necessary to dispose of them at a loss of nearly $80,000. The resultant shortage of funds necessitated the issuance of scrip, or negotiable demand warrants, in meeting the obligations of the company, and this was seized upon by the ever-present critics to cast discredit upon the enterprise.[68]

By this time, about sixty miles of the roadway had been graded, and the bridge over the Hiwassee River nearly completed; and attention was naturally directed to the procuring of rails and the putting of a portion of the road in operation. Here, however, another problem presented itself. The price of iron rails was exceedingly high—$110 a ton for imported rails, and $125 a ton for those of American manufacture. The company therefore determined to take advantage of the resources of iron ore and coal along the route, and manufacture its own iron. The Chief Engineer estimated that this could be done at a cost of about $30 a ton, and that the road could be ironed with superior rails at a saving of more than $4,000 per mile.[69]

Although this policy seems to have been adopted with laudable intentions, it merely served to supply the opponents of the road with more ammunition. The requests for additional aid from the state which was so essential to success were met by a demand for an investigation of the rumors of fraud and mismanagement, and with charges that the issuance of scrip and the manufacture of iron were both violations of the charter of the company. President Jacobs' vigorous defense of the policies adopted was eloquently supported by T. A. R. Nelson and William Rowles in the legislature, and the rumors of fraud appeared to be largely unfounded; but the expected aid from the state failed to materialize.[70]

[67] "Testimony before a Committee appointed to investigate the East Tennessee and Georgia Railroad, 1849-50", Tenn. Archives.

[68] "Communication from the President of the Hiwassee Railroad Company, to the General Assembly of Tennessee", *H. Jr., App.*, 1841-2, pp. 156-169.

[69] *Ibid.*, "Report of Chief Engineer of the Hiwassee Railroad Company", Jan. 1, 1841, *Jonesboro Whig*, Feb. 3, 1841; *Sen. Jr.*, 1841-2, pp. 376-86.

[70] *Ibid.; H. Jr.*, 1841-2, 488-90, 497; *Nashville Whig*, Dec. 24, 1841, Jan. 8, 1842, and *passim*. After having failed to get a part of the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston appropriation, the company joined with the LaGrange and Memphis Railroad Company on Jan. 27, 1842, in presenting a memorial asking immediate payment of a large part of the amounts still due on the state subscriptions; but the request received little consideration. Tenn. Archives; *Nashville Whig*, Feb. 1, 1842.

By the summer of 1842 the company was so hopelessly involved in debt and had suffered such a loss of prestige that a deed of trust was executed in favor of T. Nixon Van Dyke and Spencer Jarnagin, in an attempt to save the project from complete bankruptcy. Even this measure proved disastrous, for it led directly to the filing of a suit against the company by the Attorney General of the state on October 3, 1842, asking the forfeiture of the charter.[71] As a result of this action, all work on the road was suspended; and the Hiwassee project followed the Cincinnati and Charleston enterprise into complete abandonment, leaving about sixty-six miles of graded road, a bridge over the Hiwassee River, and an uncompleted iron establishment at Charleston, Tennessee, as mute testimonials of the fickleness of public sentiment. Although initiated with high hopes and great expectations during the boom time of 1835-6, the Hiwassee project was buried under an equally impressive revulsion of feeling against railroads during the later stages of the economic depression.

A few years later, however, when the Georgia roads, which had also been forced into suspension by the unfavorable financial situation, had been revived and were knocking at the doors of Tennessee, interest in the Hiwassee enterprise was again developed. This time it was successful, and under the new name of the East Tennessee and Georgia Railroad, was carried through to completion in 1855. The movement for a Virginia and Tennessee connection, so dear to the hearts of the editors of the *Rail-Road Advocate,* also came to life; and the East Tennessee and Virginia Railroad was completed in 1857.[72] Even the ill-fated Cincinnati and Charleston enterprise was revived during the decade of the fifties; and although the Civil War intervened, it was eventually to achieve success in a modified form during the post war period. Thus the abortive efforts of the railroad enthusiasts of the 'thirties, although barren of immediate accomplishment, served to lay down in outline form the railroad connections which eventually were to fulfill the prophecy of the *Rail-Road Advocate* and achieve the commercial salvation of East Tennessee.

---

[71] The joint answer of the Secretary and Treasurer to this bill is in the Tenn. Archives. The suit was eventually decided partly in favor of the company by the Supreme Court in 1846, *Nashville Union,* Oct. 15, 1846.

[72] J. W. Holland, "The East Tennessee and Georgia Railroad, 1836-1860", and "The Building of the East Tennessee and Virginia Railroad", in East Tenn. Hist. Soc. *Publications,* III (1931), 89-107; IV (1932), 83-101.

THE DOWNFALL OF THE RADICALS IN TENNESSEE

By J. A. Sharp

Radicalism reached the zenith of its hectic career in Tennessee politics in 1869. Receiving its power by extra-legal means, it was destined to lose it in the same way.

In January, 1865, a group of Unionists, representing a minority of the people of Tennessee, met in Nashville and declared null and void the acts of the secession government and established in its stead a *de facto* government of Union men. William G. Brownlow, the nemesis of "Rebels", was installed as governor.[1] Under the "Parson's" leadership the legislature of 1865 disfranchised all who were suspected of rebel sentiments, passed a sedition act, and organized bands of Union men to aid in suppressing "unreconstructed rebels".[2] Unionists of less radical sympathies than Brownlow disapproved of these acts and the result was a division of the Union party into two groups, the Conservatives and the Radicals.[3] Ex-Governor William B. Campbell led the former and, with other Conservatives, was elected to Congress in 1865. These five were from Middle and West Tennessee. Only three Radicals, all from East Tennessee, were elected.

The results of this election were disappointing to Brownlow and the Radicals, and they sought to make it impossible to elect Conservatives again.[4] Therefore, the legislature in 1866 passed an act which disfranchised all who had not consistently opposed secession and the Confederacy, and could not prove the same to a county commissioner of registration. The same legislature enfranchised the ex-slaves. The gubernatorial campaign of 1867 followed. Brownlow was the Radical candidate for reelection and the Conservatives nominated Emerson Etheridge. No less than Brownlow, Etheridge was adept in the art of ridicule, slander, and personal abuse of his enemies and the campaign proved exciting, especially to the negroes who voted for the first time. Evidently the commissioners of reg-

1 *Acts of Tennessee*, 1865, pp. IV-V, cited hereafter as *Acts*.
2 *Acts*, 1865, p. 32. The same legislature offered $5,000 reward for the arrest of Isham G. Harris. *Ibid.*, 147.
3 *Memphis Argus*, June 30, July 7, 1865. Hereafter cited as *Argus*.
4 *Argus*, Aug. 18, 1865.

istration did their duty; Brownlow was reelected by a sizeable majority. The new franchise act did not work to the complete satisfaction of the Radicals, however. In the Congressional election of 1868 Conservative candidates won in two districts. Acting under authority granted him by the legislature,[6] Brownlow declared the elections in these districts illegal and awarded the certificates to men of Radical persuasion.[7]

Soon after his second inauguration, Brownlow was elected to the United States Senate, but was not to take office until March 4, 1869. The interval was used to carry to completion the Radical work of reconstruction. Negro suffrage had given birth to the Ku Klux Klan which was organized by a group of ex-Confederates at Pulaski, Tennessee, in 1866. It was used to intimidate negro voters and carpetbaggers and was doubtless carried to the extreme.[8] To protect the negroes and their "votes", a special session of the legislature in 1868 made membership in the Klan a felony and empowered the governor to declare martial law.[9] Thus authorized, Governor Brownlow, on February 20, 1869, proclaimed martial law in nine Middle and West Tennessee counties where the Ku Klux Klan was particularly active.[10]

Five days later Brownlow turned the affairs of Tennessee over to the speaker of the senate, DeWitt C. Senter, but only after assuring himself that the "rebels" were thoroughly "reconstructed". With disfranchisement, negro suffrage, and martial law, Brownlow hoped that the hated "Rebel" Democratic element was forever removed from power and position. Feeling that he was entrusting the state to one who would continue his policies, he said: "Mr. DeWitt C. Senter is a loyal man, capable, tried and trusty who is sound in his principles, and will steadfastly adhere to them upon the platform of the Union Republican Party of Tennessee."[11]

Brownlow's statement was based upon his knowledge of Senter's past record. Senter was an East Tennessean and before the Civil War had served two terms in the lower house of the General Assembly. In 1861 he was reelected for a third term. Tennessee had joined the Confederacy and Senter was a Unionist, but with other East Tennessee Unionists he took his seat in the legislature and

---

[5] *Acts,* 1866-67, p. 26.
[6] *Acts,* extra, 1866, p. 56.
[7] *Knoxville Daily Whig,* Feb. 11, 1869. Hereafter cited as *Whig.*
[8] *Ibid.,* Feb. 2, 1869; Nashville *Press and Times,* Jan. 14, 1869; Jan. 20, 1869.
[9] Joshua W. Caldwell, *Constitutional History of Tenn.* (Cincinnati, 1907), 294.
[10] Memphis *Public Ledger,* Sept. 17, Oct. 12, 1868; *Whig,* Feb. 20, 1869.
[11] *Whig,* Feb. 12, 1869.

voted against secession. He remained in the "Rebel" legislature throughout its sessions of 1861 and went with it to Memphis, and stayed with it there until its adjournment *sine die* on March 20, 1862. This term in the legislature of "Harris and Company" gave his Radical enemies a good campaign issue in 1869. After the Memphis adjournment Senter started home, but was captured and imprisoned by the Confederates because of his Union sympathies. Later he was released on bond and on oath not to bear arms against the Confederacy. Nevertheless, he was driven from his home by Confederate guerillas. He escaped to Louisville, Kentucky, where he remained until after the war. In 1865 he returned to Tennessee and was a member of the Union convention that reestablished the state government. On March 4, 1865, he was elected state senator from the Fourth Senatorial District.[12] When division appeared in the ranks of the Unionists, Senter became a Radical and voted for "Rebel" disfranchisement and martial law, but opposed negro suffrage.[13]

In his inaugural address Senter was noncommittal on his political views. He commended Brownlow's "restoration of law and order", and perhaps significantly added that he expected the "cooperation of all good citizens of all classes, sects, and parties".[14] At least it is hard to imagine Brownlow calling for the cooperation of "Rebels" and Conservatives. The Knoxville *Daily Whig*, formerly Brownlow's "evil Genius", but now edited by the "Parson's" ministerial successor, Dr. T. H. Pearne, declared that Senter was a man of "marked ability, unquestionable loyalty, and of unswerving integrity".[15] However, under its new management the *Whig* was not to be the "fabled dragon, with forked tail, and cloven hoofs, and fiery tongue, whose only delight was in scattering fire brands, arrows and death".[16]

Senter was faced with the problem of continuation, abolition, or modification of the Radical policies instituted by Brownlow. To discard entirely the "Rebel" annihilation program of Brownlow would have been to admit defeat for the Radical Union party which Senter represented.[17] But to continue it unmodified was not for men less radical than Brownlow. Senter resolved to modify the Radical policy of his predecessor.

---

12 Claude A. Miller, *The Official and Political Manual of Tenn.* (Nashville, 1890), 227.
13 *Whig*, Feb. 24, 28, 1869.
14 *Ibid.*, Feb. 28, 1869.
15 *Ibid.*, Feb. 24, 1869.
16 *Ibid.*, Feb. 9, 1869.
17 *Whig*, in Memphis *Evening Post*, May 17, 1869.

Soon after his inaugural Senter issued a statement that matial law was not to supersede civil law, but to supplement it. In pursuance of this and upon the recommendation of General Joseph A. Cooper, commander of the militia, civil courts were reestablished and the duties of the troops were restricted to the assistance of the sheriffs in capturing offenders.[18] Martial law, although not abolished, was in this way made less severe and met the approval of ex-Confederates and Conservatives. Furthermore, Senter promised a Giles county delegation that as soon as fugitives were caught and brought to justice the militia would be disbanded.

The ex-Confederates made real efforts to cooperate with the soldiers and quell Ku Klux disorders.[19] These efforts were successful and order and peace were restored. Senter was true to his promise and about the first of May he disbanded thirteen companies of militia and their officers, including General Cooper. Only five companies were left in the field. Ex-Confederates and Conservatives were unanimous in approval of disbandment, and Radical East Tennesseans were pleased because the militia was expensive, and they were not very much interested in protecting loyal Middle and West Tennesseans.[20] However, it was difficult to convince the colored voters of Middle and West Tennessee that Senter had acted in their interests.[21] After martial law was removed only disfranchisement remained to keep the ex-Confederates from resuming their rightful place in the commonwealth.

That Senter did not favor immediate enfranchisement of the "Rebels" was proven by the judicial election on May 27, 1869. In 1865 Brownlow had assumed the power of appointing chancellors and supreme court judges. Protests and objections were soon heard against this infringement of the people's constitutional rights. Therefore, on February 13, 1869, the legislature passed an act which empowered Governor Senter to call a special judicial election. This election gave conclusive proof that Senter was determined to enforce the Radical franchise law. Ex-Confederates who had hoped for relief from Senter were disappointed.[22] The Radical commissioners of registration did their full duty and the Radical candidates were easily elected.

Radical exultance over the victory in the judicial election was considerably lessened by the gubernatorial convention as Nashville

[18] *Whig*, March 3, 13, 1869.
[19] *Press and Times*, Feb. 27, 1869.
[20] *Ibid.*, Jan. 29, Feb. 10, 18, 1869.
[21] Memphis *Appeal*, Jan. 28, 1869. Hereafter cited as *Appeal*.
[22] *Press and Times*, April 30, May 1, 1869.

on May 20 which split into bitter and warring factions. Senter, like most governors, was a candidate to succeed himself. Other Radicals, including General Joseph A. Cooper, General John B. Rogers, General William B. Stokes, Horace Maynard, and O. P. Temple, received some support before the convention, but the field was soon narrowed down to Senter and Stokes.

William Brickly Stokes was a native of North Carolina, but early moved to Tennessee where he became a farmer. Becoming interested in politics, he was elected before the war to represent DeKalb county in both houses of the General Assembly. In 1858 he was elected as a Whig to represent the Third Congressional District in Congress. He served in Congress until the eve of the Civil War in 1861, and after the war he was reelected to Congress where, in 1869, he was serving his fourth term.

In February, 1861, Stokes made a speech in Congress in which he opposed the constitutional right of secession, but at the same time defended the right of every state to appeal to the extra Constitutional and "inalienable right" of revolution to protect itself against "oppression and tyranny". He deplored the action of Southern states in seceding, but he opposed federal coercion to bring them back into the Union. Instead, he advocated a compromise which would assure the South that slavery would not be endangered. In this position, Stokes was following John Bell, the illustrious Constitutional Unionist, and the majority of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, including T. A. R. Nelson and Emerson Etheridge. When Tennessee by the "right" of revolution allied herself with the Confederacy, these men were faced with the difficulty of divided allegiance. They were opponents of secession and staunch supporters of the Union. They were also ardent believers in slavery and opposed to federal intervention which might endanger this time-honored institution.[23] Stokes, like many others, went through a period of indecision, and for a short time was inclined to support the Confederacy and oppose coercion. In fact at one time he appears to have definitely cast in his lot with the "Rebels". Rather conclusive proof of this is his "Duncan Letter", written May 10, 1861, to John Duncan of McMinnville, which is quoted here because of its importance in the gubernational campaign of 1869:[24]

> I have just learned that there is some misrepresentation going the rounds of your section in regard to my position in this trying crisis, and for the benefit of yourself and

[23] *Congressional Globe, Appendix,* 1861, pp. 133-138.
[24] *Whig,* June 20, 1869.

others, I write this. I have been a zealous advocate of the Union up to the time of Lincoln's Call for seventy-five thousand troops; that being in violation of the law, and for the subjugation of the South, I commend Governor Harris for his courage, and for Arming the State, and for resisting Lincoln to the point of the bayonet, and have enrolled my name as a volunteer to resist his usurpation. I have in Congress and out opposed Coercion—and all forcible measures believing that it was better to recognize the independence of the "Southern Confederacy" than to attempt to coerce them back.

I have always opposed secession, but I claim the right of revolution and the right to resist the oppression of the Federal Government and to throw off their allegiance to the same when that oppression becomes intolerable—that time has now come. I have been and am now for standing by the border slave states, for they are to be the great sufferers during the conflict. I am opposed to being tacked on to the Southern Confederacy, at present, except as a military league. But when peace is restored, if the two nations cannot live in peace, let all the fifteen states elect delegates, meet in Convention, form their Constitution and submit it to the people for ratification.

I had announced myself as a candidate for re-election but on receiving Lincoln's proclamation for troops, I abandoned the canvass at once, and I am no candidate. I claim to have done my duty in trying to heal our difficulty and restore peace. That having failed I shall now march forward in the discharge of my duty in resisting Lincoln, regardless of false charges, or what not, by them who are trying to put me down. Time will tell where we all stand and who have been faithful.

"Time" did "tell", and it found William B. Stokes entering the Union army on May 15, 1862, more than a year after he wrote the above. Presumably, the interim was spent in the interest of the Confederacy. His enemies charged that upon the fall of Fort Donelson, in February, 1862, Stokes deserted the Confederate service and joined the Federal army, but there is little proof for this. More probably his vacillation was caused by Middle Tennessee sentiment which was decidedly pro-Southern in 1861. Then Federal military successes in Tennessee and the establishment of military government gave Stokes a chance to ally himself with the Union

where the most of his sentiment at least belonged. He served throughout the war and rose to the rank of major general. But the fact that he almost became a "Rebel" made good campaign material for his enemies in the gubernatorial canvass of 1869.

In East Tennessee, the stronghold of Radicalism, Stokes was somewhat the favorite before the convention. His military record was more convincing than Senter's term in the "Rebel" legislature and confinement in a Confederate prison, because the "boys in blue" from East Tennessee respected the fighter.[25] This does not mean that Senter, an East Tennessean and the successor of the idol of East Tennessee Radicals, was without honor in his own section. Several counties endorsed him and in April the *Whig,* the central organ of Radicalism, hoisted his name to its column head, asserting that Senter was a "gallant, true, and tried Republican", an East Tennessean, and an opponent of "sectional proscription".[26]

All was not harmony in the Radical camp before the convention. Even rock-ribbed Sevier county, of unanimous Union sentiment and a hot-bed of Radicalism, failed to agree upon a candidate for state senator and nominated two candidates and discussed a third, the "Soldiers Candidate". In Blount, Cocke, and Greene counties there was similar lack of Radical concert. The Radical Clarkesville *Patriot* mournfully and aptly described the Radical division: "Petty jealousies, individual ambition, narrow-minded selfishness, and criminal ignorance have combined to disrupt the party. . . It is quarrel, scratch, and bite from the Holston to the Mississippi".[27] Indeed this seems to have been the real situation. Radicalism was intent upon preserving itself, but its over zealous leaders defeated their own purposes by dividing their support between two men.

Real pre-convention issues were few. It was reported that both Senter and Stokes had liberal opinions on the franchise law, but the *Whig* vigorously denied that Senter would oppose a law that he had voted to enact. Stokes stated that after Ku Klux disorders had ceased he would favor gradual enfranchisement by the legislature.[28] Senter was not as definite as this, and as a Radical East Tennessean and successor to Brownlow he was believed to be less likely to hold liberal views on the suffrage question. Besides, he had demonstrated his simon-pure Radicalism in the recent judicial election by enforcing the franchise law. If further proof was lacking of

25 *Appeal,* May 14, 1869.
26 *Whig,* April 24, 1869.
27 *Patriot,* quoted in *Whig,* April 25, 1869.
28 *Press and Times,* June 7, 1869.

Senter's Radicalism, Brownlow furnished it by supporting his successor for the gubernatorial nomination. Thus, neither candidate gave the ex-Confederates much hope that their disabilities would soon be removed.

There was no openly organized pre-convention canvass for either of the candidates. But county delegations to the convention were instructed and Radical newspapers announced for their favorite candidate. There was little discussion of issues and neither candidate showed much liberality toward the disfranchised. Therefore, the division that occurred in the convention was not the result of any belief that Senter favored enfranchisement. It was merely the result of a factional rivalry within the Radical party.

On May 20, 1869, the Radical hosts of Tennessee assembled in Nashville to nominate a standard bearer to maintain the "loyal" government which had protected their homes and their property from the depredations and ravages of the wicked and heartless "Rebels". But alas, this task was well-nigh hopeless. Disagreement first resulted over the election of a temporary chairman. Each faction desired this position because of the chairman's power to appoint committees. The Stokes faction had a decided advantage because A. M. Cate, a Stokes supporter, was chairman of the Republican State Central Committee and as such called the convention to order and conducted the temporary organization. Cate did not fail to take advantage of his strategic position to the great discomfiture of the Senter faction.

After Cate had called the convention to order, Judge L. C. Houk, a Senter supporter, nominated Reverend T. H. Pearne for temporary chairman. Cate refused to accept the nomination on the ground that he had not stated that nominations were in order. Pearne was again nominated, but Cate still refused to accept the nomination. Cate now announced that nominations were in order and almost immediately recognized a Stokes partisan who nominated R. R. Butler for temporary chairman. Thereupon Judge Houk mounted a convenient desk, called for a vote on Pearne, and declared him elected. Cate at the same time declared Butler elected. There were now two temporary chairmen. Both Pearne and Butler proceeded to the chair but Cate refused to leave it. The convention was soon turned into a bedlam fit only for lunatics. Champions of Senter and Stokes disputed together for the doubtful honor of making the most noise and confusion. Whiskey flowed freely, and drunken yells, curses, jeers, and catcalls furnished enjoyment only

to the Democrats in the galleries. Even a colored delegate advised his dusky brothers to "be more respectful than these white men".[29] The clamour continued until a motion to adjourn until the afternoon was made. Cate declared that the motion carried, but Pearne ruled that it did not carry, and undertook to organize the Senter group. The Stokes group, however, remained in the hall and prevented Pearne from organizing Senter's followers.[30]

Reassembling in the afternoon with Pearne, Cate, and Butler still claiming the chair, the convention again failed to organize. The afternoon session lasted three hours with the same vociferous discord of the morning. In fact it was worse because the police had to prevent a fight between R. R. Butler and Colonel D. M. Nelson who had drawn their pistols. The convention again adjourned to meet the next morning.

Before daylight the next morning Pearne was secreted into the convention hall, and when Cate came in he was nonplussed for "there sat, bolt upright, the imperturbable Pearne, with the cool and placid air of a matronly hen on a nest".[32] Apparently, both factions realized that the convention was a failure, because a motion to adjourn *sine die* was carried unanimously and both Cate and Pearne pronounced the convention adjourned.[33]

It was at this juncture that Butler rushed to the chair and organized the Stokes faction. Stokes was declared to be the regular nominee with the support of fifty-four county delegations. In a speech Stokes stated that he had forty thousand colored votes before starting the canvass. He had support for this statement because gaudily attired colored citizens were prominent in the convention and showed preference for Stokes, as, said one, "the man that wears the blue". Senter's disbandment of the militia made him less desirable than Stokes to the newly enfranchised black men.

The Senter faction also assembled and with Pearne as chairman an organization was effected. Resolutions were passed which declared Senter to be the regular nominee of the "National Republican Party". Senter accepted the nomination and said that he hoped for Tennessee "a condition of quiet, security, liberty, equality, progress and development".[34] But Senter was not yet ready to extend the

[29] *Memphis Evening Post,* May 24, 1869. Hereafter cited *Post.*
[30] *Ibid.,* May 21, 1869.
[31] *Appeal,* May 21, 1869.
[32] *Whig,* May 21, 1869; *Post,* May 28, 1869.
[33] *Appeal,* May 22, 1869; *Post,* May 24, 1869.
[34] *Press and Times,* in *Press and Messenger,* May 26, 1869.

suffrage to the late "Rebels", and stated that he did not favor this change in the Radical policy of his predecessor.

After the Nashville fiasco charges and counter-charges were forthcoming from both factions of the Radical party. Each charged the other with having "packed" the county delegations, and with sending "bogus" delegations to secure the nomination of their favorites. These charges were doubtless true and one faction was as guilty as the other. The Nashville *Press and Times,*[36] a Stokes organ, charged that the administration office-holders, "school-funders", and "railroad rings" were all supporting Senter, and that they were planning to manipulate the ballot-box to elect him. The Senter faction claimed that Cate had attempted to organize the convention in the interest of Stokes. It was obvious that Cate had done this. In proof of this charge Senter's friends cited an attempt that Cate had made to expel Senter from the state Senate. On November 12, 1868, as a senator from Hamilton county, he introduced a resolution to expel Speaker Senter because he had served in the "Rebel" legislature, and was thus ineligible for office by provision of the Fourteenth Amendment.[37] The resolution failed to pass, but it was sufficient reason for the charge that Cate had a personal grudge against Senter, and therefore had attempted to control the convention for Stokes.

During the campaign of 1869 an attempt was made to connect Stokes with Cate's proposal to expel Senter from the Senate. In 1868 Stokes was a candidate for Congress from the Third Congressional District and stopped at Cate's home. While there Cate asked Stokes if the Fourteenth Amendment did not disqualify Senter for office. Stokes replied that it did unless Senter's disabilities should be removed by a two-thirds vote of Congress. A. G. Sharp, mayor of Chattanooga, who was present during the conversation, testified to the truth of this. It was after this conversation that Cate introduced the expulsion resolution, but Stokes denied advising Cate to introduce it. Besides, he said he had voted in Congress to have Senter's disabilities removed.[38] Whether true or not, this "Cate-Stokes Conspiracy" furnished many a text for Senter's speakers during the gubernatorial campaign.

The attitude taken by the Conservatives toward the Radical candidates is interesting. They announced their intentions to support

[35] *Press and Times,* May 21, 1869.

[36] May 26, 1869.

[37] Section three of that amendment denied the right to hold office to anyone who had "previously taken an oath, ... to support the Constitution of the United States", and had then "engaged in insurrection or rebelllion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof".

[38] *Whig,* May 25, 1869.

neither candidate unless one wing of the divided party should promise a policy of liberality toward the disfranchised. They nominated no candidate of their own, and thus threatened to hold the balance of power between the two Radical candidates. Some were inclined at first to look with favor upon Stokes because he was a Middle Tennessean and was not connected with "Brownlowism" as closely as Senter. Furthermore, they feared that Senter would use the franchise law, as Brownlow had used it, to perpetuate the "loyal" government.[39] The Conservatives soon gave their support to Senter, however.

On June 3 the Conservative Knoxville *Press and Messenger* had not yet decided which of the Radical candidates to support, but on June 9 it came out unreservedly for Senter and declared him to be "manly, unequivocal, and statesman-like", while Stokes was described as a "narrow minded, insincere, and driveling demagogue clinging for support to the lowest passions engendered by a civil strife now four years gone". The reason for this sudden transformation in Conservative sentiment was the opening speeches of Senter and Stokes in Nashville on June 5. Stokes spoke first and said that he favored gradual enfranchisement, and proposed that this be accomplished by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly upon each individual disfranchised resident of Tennessee that could prove he was peaceful and law-abiding.[40] He devoted the most of his speech to a scathing denunciation of Brownlow's and Senter's administration of the finances of the state which, he said, had increased the state debt from $16,000,000 to $40,000,000. "School funders", railroad receivers, and Northern office seekers were placed in the same category, and to Stokes all of these were a disgrac to the state.[41]

After Stokes finished his speech Senter advanced to the stand and said to Stokes, "William, I am with you until the first Thursday in August."[42] He showed some inclination to overlook the suffrage

[39] *Press and Messenger,* May 12, 1869.

[40] *Appeal,* June 6, 1869.

[41] *Press and Messenger,* June 9, 1869.

[42] The following account of this scene is interesting: "As they stood together for a moment, the scene was quite affecting. It was worth the pen of a painter.... There was Senter, young, rotund, fresh, flushing, and handsome. His face was plump, rosy, and well set off by dark eyes, whiskers and hair. On the other hand, Stokes, very pale and thin, and quite the reverse of handsome. His face is as thin as an old hatchet; his nose is long and comes to a sharp point over a chin that is not all a chin, for there is very little of it. His head is bald and shiny as polished marble, his forehead is high, prominent, and projects out over the eyes, and withal, well developed. His ears seem set back an inch or two farther than they ought to be. It cannot be denied that he has a head well stored with brains. Anyone who is under the impression that Billy Stokes is a fool can relieve themselves of the error by taking a look at his head and hearing him speak. As a rough and tumble speaker he ranks next to A. J. [Andrew Johnson]." *Post,* June 11, 1869.

question until he was stopped by Stokes and asked if he favored "universal suffrage". He answered in the affirmative and pledged himself to recommend to the next legislature the removal of the disabilities of all who were tax payers.

This was as sudden and unexpected to many as a thunderbolt from a clear sky would have been. On the same day that Senter made this declaration, the Radical organ in Knoxville was accusing Stokes of favoring "universal suffrage", and published a letter which declared: "Whenever the rebels restore to us the thousands of blue-eyed boys of the mountains who were starved to death in Andersonville and other rebel hells, then and not til then, will people of East Tennessee vote for General Stokes and Universal Suffrage."[43] As soon as the ink dried on this, the *Whig* performed some peculiar journalistic acrobatics, and rather unconvincingly defended the cause of "universal suffrage".

It is not easy to explain this sudden transformation of Senter and his Radical followers. Political expendiency seems the most plausible explanation, but perhaps this is not sufficient. Senter's whole career as legislator and as governor had not been such as to indicate that he favored liberalism toward the ex-Confederates.[44] But now in the heat of a political debate in which his opponent had already declared his opposition to wholesale enfranchisement of the ex-Confederates and had thereby made a bid for both colored and white Radical support, little was left for Senter to do except to endorse universal suffrage, and thus gain the support of the great body of the Conservatives and the disfranchised. Besides, the state Supreme Court had recently ruled that Brownlow's free use of proclamations to annul registrations of voters was illegal, and that those who had been disfranchised in this way could again vote.[45] By this decision it was estimated that from twenty to thirty thousand new voters would be added to the electorate. Senter knew that these voters would support the candidate of "universal suffrage". Furthermore, the very fact that a Radical court had thus reversed an act of a Radical administration was sufficient evidence that a more liberal policy had permeated the hearts of at least some Radicals, and Senter knew that he would have some support within his own party. Senter himself might be classed as a liberal Radical because he had disbanded the militia and had evidenced a spirit of cooperation in his inaugural address. Senter also claimed to be in line with the

[43] *Whig*, June 9, 1869.
[44] *Post*, June 29, 1869.
[45] *Appeal*, May 28, 1869.

National Republican party and Grant's administration which had manifested some inclination to deal more liberally with the late "Rebels".[46] This, however, was disputed by Stokes who claimed that he was the representative of the National Republican party. Political expediency and liberal Radicalism seem the most plausible explanations of Senter's sudden reversal on his party's policy of dealing with the ex-Confederates.

The battle cry of the campaign became "Senter and Universal Suffrage," and all other issues were side-tracked. The disfranchised without exception endorsed the Radical who had voted to disfranchise them, and aligned themselves with "Old Proc",[47] the one Radical they most cordially despised. However reluctant the ex-Confederates may have been to support any man who had the backing of Brownlow, they excused themselves by saying that they were not going to Brownlow's side but that he had at last been converted to their side and that they welcomed all new recruits no matter how personally undesirable. Indeed, it was an anomalous position in which Brownlow and other Radicals found themselves when they gave support to Senter who seemed now to be the champion of the cause of the "Rebels". Many regretted their early choice and turned to the support of Stokes.

Brownlow, however, remained true to his alliance with Senter. This palsied old gentleman spent the summer of 1869 at Montvale Springs in Blount county. He took no active part in the campaign, but East Tennessee Radicals anxiously awaited some word from their oracle. On June 12, the Radical deity spoke in a letter to the *Whig*. Brownlow defended the passage of the franchise law as a necessity, but declared that peace and order had been restored and that the disfranchised should be given the ballot. He proposed, however, that enfranchisement should be accomplished through regular constitutional channels—a process that would require at least two years.[48] Brownlow hoped that this delay would give the Radicals time to establish themselves firmly in power. He argued that they already had control of the courts for another eight years. But rather sadly the old Radical referred to the Supreme Court of his own appointment which had recently annulled his own acts and had thereby en-

[46] Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency* (Boston, 1898), I, 318-320. The National Republican platform of 1868, in reference to the disfranchised, read: "We favor the removal of the disqualifications and restrictions imposed upon the late rebels in the same measure as the spirit of disloyalty will die out, and as may be consistent with the safety of the loyal people."

[47] Brownlow was termed this because of his frequent use of proclamations.

[48] *Post*, June 15, 1869.

franchised a great body of voters. Some of these, Brownlow said, had been "active leaders" of the rebellion and should have been disfranchised "for life". The court's decision, however, was evidence to Brownlow as well as to Senter that enfranchisement could not long be delayed.[49]

Thus Brownlow rather reluctantly accepted the new role that had been thrust upon him. It was believed by many that he had been influenced by his son, Colonel John Bell Brownlow, who was a railroad receiver under Senter and a leader of the Senter faction.[50]

Later in the summer Brownlow wrote another letter to the *Whig* to assure the colored Radicals that Senter had as much claim upon their support as Stokes. The majority of the colored voters, however, seem to have feared that Senter's militia disbandment and universal suffrage policies would cause the return of "Rebel" and Ku Klux rule, and with few exceptions they supported Stokes.[51]

East Tennessee Radicals, formerly rabid followers of Brownlow, were hard to convince that "Old Proc" had gone over to their enemies. An account was printed of one who did not believe it until shown one of Brownlow's letters in the *Whig*. The effect upon this loyal mountaineer is both colorful and interesting: "He took it and read it over twice, laid the paper down, wiped his spectacles with a red cotton handkerchief, blew his nose with his fingers, took an immense chew of tobacco, and sat speechless for at least five minutes."[52]

At last this astonished Radical exclaimed, "Great God, what are we coming to?" Brownlow's faithlessness, to this man, meant that "loyalty" was doomed and that the "Rebels" would again tyrannize over East Tennessee.

From Middle Tennessee came a like cry that is interesting aside from its peculiar mixture of geographical, astronomical and Biblical descriptives:[53]

> We are prepared to hear that the roses were blooming in the snow-clad Lapland; that the Orange and Cocoa grove of the tropics were pendant....with icicles; that the sun and moon had changed their orbits; that the brow of night would no longer utter speech, nor darkness show knowledge of the architect of the Universe; yea, we were prepared to hear that the tide of the Mississippi had rolled

[49] *Whig*, June 13, 1869.
[50] *Appeal*, Aug. 29, 1869.
[51] *Whig*, July 20, 1869.
[52] *Press and Messenger*, June 30, 1869.
[53] *Shelbyville Republican*, in *Whig*, July 1, 1869.

> back to the Minnesota, and that of the Missouri to the slopes of the Rocky Mountains, but we were not prepared to hear that the Boanerges of Tennessee Radicalism had basely deserted his own standard and allied himself with Andrew Johnson, Isham G. Harris, Emerson Etheridge, N. B. Forrest and every unrepentant rebel in the State on the suffrage question, but so it is.

In like manner, the Radical die-hards raved everywhere and many refused to follow Senter and Brownlow who had betrayed their party into the hands of its enemies. But the abnormal alliance was complete, and at least Andrew Johnson and Emerson Etheridge of the quartet mentioned above took up the cudgel of "Senter and Universal Suffrage", but with more consistency than did Brownlow and the "Senterites". At Dresden, the eloquent Ethridge happily spoke of the fulfillment of his own prophesies: "The Aurora of that day has already come forth. On the mountains of the East even now she smiling stands. The valleys of the West are all aglow with the light of liberty which beams from her heavenly face; from her rosy fingers the dews of peace are being scattered, and the sad earth is smiling again."[54]

Andrew Johnson campaigned the state in vindication of himself and in the interest of Senter. At Maryville he barely escaped rough treatment from a drunken-crazed mob of Stokes Radicals. In Middle and West Tennessee, he received a better reception than he had received from the same "Rebels" in 1862 when he established military government over them.

The campaign progressed. Senter and Stokes toured the state in a joint canvass. East Tennessee, the home of Radicalism, was chosen as the main battleground. The joint canvass of this section opened at Cleveland on June 11, and closed at Madisonville on July 5. Only one month was left for Middle and West Tennessee. Into practically every county of East Tennessee went the rival Radical candidates, both defending their Union war records and appealing to the slowly dying war passions of East Tennesseans. Senter argued that although he had been a member of the "Rebel" legislature, his Union sympathy was well known to East Tennesseans. Stokes did not deny the "Duncan Letter" episode, but submitted his Union army record to the "boys in blue" who had fought with him. To these, some of whom had obtained Federal jobs through his influence, Stokes was more desirable than Senter who had not fought

[54] *Press and Messenger*, July 28, 1869.

and who was now advocating a policy that would allow the "Rebels" once more to gain control of the state. Senter had the support of a few Federal soldiers who held state positions, but the majority of East Tennessee Radicals preferred General Stokes.

The campaign of bitter personalities and passions continued. Maryville Radicals threatened Senter with the charge that he had betrayed them to the "Rebels". At Clinton, a personal encounter between the candidates was narrowly avoided.[55] At Loudon, Stokes denounced the inconsistency of Brownlow and thereby aroused the wrath of General James P. Brownlow who took the stand and said that he was responsible for his father's support of Senter. At Jackson, the "Rebel" audience greeted Stokes with "yells and insults" and mobbed the Radical negroes, but when Senter appeared "cheers and music" welcomed him.[56] Senter accused Stokes of everything from personal cowardice to immorality. Likewise Stokes was not any too sure of Senter's bravery or his honesty in handling state finances.

The canvass, though one of bitter animosities, had introduced into it an element which was of far more vital consequence. This was Governor Senter's manipulation of the franchise law to insure his election. Most observers early foresaw that this Radical law would be an important factor in the election. It gave to the governor the power to appoint and remove commissioners of registration. Governor Brownlow had freely exercised this power as well as the power to annul registrations, and in this way had guarded the ballot-box against voters who had supported the Confederacy.

As the campaign progressed it became apparent to Governor Senter that Stokes would get a large majority of the Radical vote and that his own reelection could be insured only by getting the votes of the disfranchised. Fortunately for Senter, this was easy because of his power to remove and appoint commissioners of registration. Therefore, he began the wholesale removal of Radical registrars and the appointment of Conservatives to take their places. Within a month most of the old registrars were replaced by more liberal men who were not very particular about obeying the franchise law, and issued certificates to thousands of "Rebels".[57] Their "judicial power" gave them this right and they did not construe "loyalty" to mean necessarily the support of the Union during the war. In Dyer county, the new registrar had been in office only a week when it was reported that he had already issued twelve hundred cer-

[55] *Post*, July 3, 1869.
[56] Nashville *State Journal*, in *Post*, July 29, 1869.
[57] *Post*, July 7, 1869.

tificates to "disloyal men", and that the "loyal men" of the county only numbered six hundred.[58] It was soon estimated that sixty of the eighty-four registrars had been removed, and that by election day less than five thousand men would be without certificates of registration.[59] In this way the "Rebels" were given the ballot throughout the state, and the franchise law was virtually annulled[60].

The Radical followers of Stokes were loud in their criticism of Senter's action. From Maury county, Radical objection to their new registrar took this form:[61]

> Robert D. Rickets
> Certificate Vender!
>
> Indorses for every rebel Democrat and secures certificates whether he knows him or not. This is the man who packs certificates, and no doubt pledges his "word of honor" that everybody, even the "Devil," who was the original rebel, is loyal to the Government of the United States.

While the Radicals howled, the Conservative Unionists and the ex-Confederates were jubilant. They manifested their joy at the approaching downfall of Radicalism:[62]

> Their days are numbered, they are like the grass; in the morning of their pride and strength they flourished, and now in the evening they will be cut down, and the places which knew them once, the high places of power which they have trod with the heel of oppression, will resound to their footsteps no more.

Their fate was palpable to the most sanguine of the Stokes Radicals, and in desperation they undertook to stay the inevitable tide which threatened to engulf them. At first, they resorted to injunctions, but the state Supreme Court upheld the governor's removal power.[63] The injunctions were dissolved and Senter's registrars took office. Foiled in this attempt to safeguard the ballot-box from the "Rebels", Stokes and his followers threatened Federal military intervention and the reestablishment of Federal military government. In fact, men were sent to Washington, but they were not successful in getting military aid. They were successful, however, in getting the endorsement of Stokes by two of President

58 *Press and Messenger*, July 7, 1869.
59 *Post*, July 31, 1869.
60 Temple, *op. cit.*, 183.
61 *Press and Messenger*, July 7, 1869.
62 *Ibid.*
63 *Post*, July 9, 1869.

Grant's cabinet officers,[64] but this was small help in getting more votes for Stokes. Threats continued. "Rebels" with fraudulent certificates were charged with breaking their army paroles and were threatened with arrest and trial before military court.[65] Some Radicals even advocated the organization of a Stokes government in case Senter should be elected with the hope that Congress would intervene and recognize it as the legal government.[66]

These threats were of no avail. Senter was governor and had all the power of Radical legislative enactments behind him. He claimed that he had removed only registrars who had violated the law, and that he had instructed his appointees to show no partiality in granting certificates. Brownlow had used the militia to prevent the "Rebels" from voting, and now Senter threatened to use it to protect these same men in their right to vote. This must have caused the "Parson" much loss of sleep. The Radical sedition law, which was designed to prevent criticism of Brownlow's "loyal" government, was now about to be used in criminal prosecution of the Radicals, who had made the law, because they were saying treasonable things about Senter's "loyal" government. The militia and sedition laws were not used, but no doubt they would have been had Senter deemed it necessary.

It soon became evident to all that universal suffrage was already a reality. Before the canvass was over the Stokes faction was reluctantly accepting this situation. One Stokes Radical remarked: "Universal Suffrage can do no more than has already been done for the disfranchised of this Country....While gubernatorial candidates are wrangling over this question, the Governor is having it opened to all applicants, and it is now best to turn attention to other issues as that is settled."[67] Stokes himself recognized this, and in Middle and West Tennessee he reversed his East Tennessee pronouncements on universal suffrage and became as good a suffrage candidate as Senter. At Memphis he said: "Suffrage is a dead letter. Any man can get a certificate."[68] At Huntington he declared: "I will enfranchise every man on God's green earth who will come up and ask for it."[69] This was somewhat different from his East Tennessee statement, earlier in the campaign, that he would have his "tongue

[64] *Ibid.*, July 27, 1869. These were Postmaster General Cresswell and Secretary of the Treasury Boutwell.
[65] Nashville *State Journal*, in *Post*, July 26, 1869.
[66] Chattanooga *Republican*, in *Post*, July 27, 1869.
[67] *Press and Messenger*, July 21, 1869.
[68] *Post*, July 19, 1869.
[69] *Press and Messenger*, July 21, 1869.

torn out by the roots" before he would consent to enfranchisement of the "Rebels".[70] But in East Tennessee Stokes was talking to Radicals, whereas in Middle and West Tennessee his audiences were composed of former supporters of the Confederacy who now had certificates to vote. The *Press and Messenger* with great satisfaction described the Radical discomfiture:[71]

> He digged a hole, he digged it deep,
> He digged it for his brother;
> But in the hole, he tumbled in,
> That he had digged for t'other.

Radical prospects were indeed gloomy, but the outlook was pleasing to the Conservatives. At first they pledged themselves to follow a policy of strict neutrality by not running candidates for the legislature. But when Senter started the removal of Radical registrars, Conservative candidates were announced for the legislature. There were now three legislative tickets, namely: Senter Republicans, Stokes Radicals, and Conservatives. As a result of the division of the normal Radical vote, the Conservatives, with the aid of the newly enfranchised "Rebels", had little difficulty in electing their candidates. This action of the Conservatives and "Rebels" demonstrated that they did not trust the Senter Republicans, and that they were determined to make assurance doubly sure of the removal of "Rebel" disabilities by electing a Conservative legislature.[72]

The Senter Republicans did not like this breach of trust by the Conservatives. They well knew that a Conservative legislature would sweep the last vestiges of Radical legislation from the statute books, and thus turn the state government over to the ex-Confederates. Few Senter Republicans, to say nothing of the Radicals, were ready to see this extreme carried out, but it was a natural result.[73] The Senter Republicans and the Conservatives united upon the one plank of universal suffrage, and Senter was more interested in securing his election than he was in universal suffrage. The Conservatives, on the other hand, were interested only in Senter because he made it possible for the disfranchised to vote.[74] Prospects of a Conservative legislature drove many Senter Republicans to the Stokes banner.[75] Even Pearne of the *Whig* became almost frantic

---

[70] *Ibid.*
[71] *Ibid.*, June 30, 1869.
[72] Nashville *Banner*, in *Whig*, July 17, 1869; *Cleveland Banner*, in *Press and Messenger*, July 22, 1869.
[73] *Post*, July 23, 1869.
[74] *Appeal*, Aug. 7, 1869.
[75] *Post*, July 31, 1869.

when Conservatives were announced for the legislature, and showed far more concern for the defeat of the Conservatives than for the election of Senter.

Election day, August 5, finally came. Brownlow left his Montvale health retreat and came to Knoxville to cast his vote for Senter. Presentiment must have been his when he saw hundreds of the detested "Rebel" sect voting for the same man. Senter was elected by a majority of over sixty-five thousand. Stokes received about the normal Radical vote, although he fell short of Grant's vote in 1868 by almost two thousand. This showed that the Radical party in Tennessee was still virtually intact and that Senter received support from only a small minority of it. But the thousands whom Senter had irregularly enfranchised gave him a majority of overwhelming proportions.[76]

The Conservatives easily obtained a majority in the legislature. Only eight Stokes Radicals were elected, and all of these were from East Tennessee. Thirteen Senter Republicans were elected, and eight of these were from East Tennessee. All the rest were Conservatives, the most of whom were from Middle and West Tennessee, although twenty-one were elected in East Tennessee because of the Radical schism.[77]

The Radicals were completely routed. Although they were not destroyed, their party (the Republican) was never again to have ascendancy in Tennessee. The Conservative assembly which convened on October 4, 1869, took action that placed the state in the control of the ex-Confederates and inaugurated a new era in Tennessee's political history.

[76] *Press and Messenger,* Aug. 18, 1869.
[77] *Ibid.*

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF TENNESSEE'S WAR OF THE ROSES

By Daniel M. Robison

The War of the Roses, as the gubernatorial contest between Robert L. and Alfred A. Taylor was called, was one of the most unique political fights ever staged in Tennessee. The dramatic side of the campaign has been told often and well,[1] but the political implications of the contest have been largely obscured. How did it come that the two major parties of the state selected the brothers as their candidates for the governorship?

Although "Bob" Taylor received the Democratic nomination nearly two months after the Republicans had named his brother "Alf" as their nominee,[2] the significant facts of the situation must be found in the preliminaries leading up to the action of the Democrats. These include not only the pre-convention contest within the Democratic party but also divisions which had occurred within that party over a period of years. A detailed examination of all events leading to the conditions existing within the Democratic party is impossible here, but a general understanding of them is important for a correct approach to the campaign year of 1886.

Within the Democratic party there were three groups with different economic and political points of view and, at various times, more or less hostile to each other. The oldest of these, and the one which was numerically superior to either of the other two, was made up of the small-farmer elements within the party. In late frontier days these had been consolidated by Andrew Jackson and, under his leadership, had occupied a commanding place in party councils

---

[1] See especially: James P., Alf A., and Hugh L. Taylor, *Life and Career of Senator Rovert Love Taylor* (Nashville, 1913); DeLong Rice, *Old Limber or the Tale of the Taylors* (Nashville, 1921); Paul Deresco Augsburg, *Bob and Alf Taylor* (Morristown, Tenn., 1925); Will Allen Dromgoole, *The Heart of Old Hickory and Other Stories of Tennessee* (Boston, 1895). The contemporary reports of "Armeil" (George H. Armistead), who accompanied the brothers as the representative of the old *Nashville American* are full of drama and color. See *American* for Sept. and Oct., 1896.

[2] The Republican convention met in Nashville on June 18, and that of the Democrats on Aug. 11, 1886.

for many years.[3] The strength of the old Jacksonian democracy in the state had always rested in the rural counties, away from such commercial centers as Knoxville, Nashville, Jackson, and Memphis and from the more wealthy agricultural communities.[4] Although James K. Polk succeeded to the nominal leadership of the Jackson forces, so much of his career coincided with that of his illustrious chief and his death came so soon after that of Jackson[5] that he has long been looked upon as coming within the Jackson epoch. Upon Polk's death, the leadership of the rural Democracy fell to Andrew Johnson.[6] Johnson continued to lead this element of the state's population throughout the fifties although its dominant position within the party had been challenged by the extremists on slavery and state rights. Johnson's loyalty to the Union from 1861 to 1865 lost him, for the time being, a large portion of his following, but the unhappy results of the war in Tennessee together with Johnson's presidential policies during Reconstruction regained him much of his lost prestige in the state. As a result, by 1875 he had so far consolidated his old strength that a Democratic legislature elected him to his former seat in the United States Senate. Within a few months after his election Johnson died and left the rural Democracy of Tennessee without a recognized leader until the War of the Roses, a decade later.

Another group within the Democratic party had formed during the period of the slavery controversy and was composed of those who adhered to Calhoun's doctrines of state sovereignty. In the beginning it was made up of the larger planters, and such others as

---

[3] An interesting discussion of Jackson's part in the consolidation and leadership of this group is found in Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1932), 227-249, 355. Mr. Abernethy ascribes to Jackson a rather inglorious part and questions, not without some apparent contradiction, his sincerity and honesty of purpose. Regardless of motives, Jackson did become the leader of this group not only in the state but in the nation, which fact is attested by the well accepted term "Jacksonian Democracy".

[4] Arthur Charles Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913), see maps in Appendix; Thomas P. Abernethy, "Political Geography of Southern Jacksonism", *East Tenn. Hist. Soc., Publications,* No. 3 (1931), 40; Robert Loren Hargis, *The Know-Nothing Party in Tennessee* (unpublished M. A. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1931). See especially the maps and tabulations of votes contained in this thesis.

[5] Polk died in 1849, four years after Jackson's death, and from the presidential campaign of 1844, Polk's time had been largely devoted to national affairs.

[6] Robert W. Winston, *Andrew Johnson* (New York, 1928), 26-94. See especially chapter entitled "Successor to Andrew Jackson" 26-39. See also George Fort Milton, *The Age of Hate* (New York, 1930), 74-97, and Lloyd Paul Stryker, *Andrew Johnson* (New York, 1930), 5-35.

fell under their influence.[7] Even before Jackson's retirement from the Presidency and during his bitter controversy with Calhoun, he recognized that the latter had adherents among the Democrats of Tennessee.[8] The conservatism of Tennessee Democrats, together with their robust nationalism, inherited from Jackson, Polk, and frontier days, tended to minimize the effects of this schism; but with the coming of Johnson, hater of aristocrats, to the leadership of the "common people", it was inevitable that the planter group should fight back. Under such circumstances, Isham G. Harris became spokesman of the state rights wing of the Democracy, followed Johnson as governor in 1857, and overwhelmed the latter's influence with the secession of the state in June of 1861. The misfortunes of war and the Brownlow regime threw Harris' influence into temporary eclipse, and it was not until 1877, two years after Johnson's death, that the war governor came again into power. During the next two decades, however, he held undisputed leadership of the old state rights Democracy which came to include a majority of the office-holding class as well as those most susceptible to appeals to war prejudices. Not only did Harris hold complete sway over his own group but he and his followers held a commanding position in party councils so that, during much of the time, they were able to dictate as to policies and preferment. The Harris faction was generally referred to as the "machine crowd" or "Bourbons" by those opposing it.

The third faction within the Democracy was under the leadership of Colonel A. S. Colyar, newspaper publisher of Nashville, and received the title "Mugwump" from its rivals. This group consisted of a large number of former Whigs from Middle and West Tennessee as well as of those interested in the industrial development of the state. The old-line Whigs had inherited a dislike for Democrats and a distrust of their principles, but the long dispute over slavery, the war itself, and finally, the radical policies of Reconstruction had driven a majority of those in the central and western sections into the Democratic party. The industrialists, centering around the powerful railroad interests in the state, included many former Whigs as well as some traditional Democrats whose talents, wealth, or influence aligned them with the new economic order. Though small in number as compared with either the state rights

[7] This split in the Democracy became evident with the Nashville Convention of 1850. See Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee*, 329-336.

[8] John Spencer Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson* (Washington, 1926-1931), IV, 305, letter to John C. McLemore.

group or the rural Democracy, the Whig-industrialist faction was powerful in resources. In addition, their natural inclination toward Republican policies of government made it easy for them to join with the Republicans whenever the Democrats ignored their views or leaders too completely. The strength of the Republicans in the state was such that the "Mugwumps" all but held a balance of power, and this strategic position gave them an influence in Democratic circles out of proportion to their numbers.[9]

Opposed to this divided Democracy was a strong Republican minority composed largely of former Unionists.[10] The Republicans were compact as to area and, after time had healed the breach between Radicals and Conservatives of Reconstruction days, they developed a tendency to vote solidly. The Republican party of Tennessee differed from that in states to the south in that it was controlled by native whites rather than by the carpet-bag and negro combination. In spite of this fact, its championship of negro rights made it feared in those sections of Middle and West Tennessee where the blacks were numerous and where the issue of white supremacy was acute. The party had experienced a steady growth in the state. Its vote of 90,000 in the Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876 had increased to 125,000 in the Cleveland-Blaine campaign of 1884, and the state's leading independent paper was not alone in its observation that the Republicans had "gained wonderfully in substantial strength".[11]

---

[9] When the Democrats captured the state in 1870, following Reconstruction, their governor was General John C. Brown. Governor Brown was of an influential Whig family of Middle Tennessee. He was a brother of the former Whig governor, Neill S. Brown, and was an elector on the Bell-Everett ticket in 1860. After his retirement from the governorship, he became interested in railroads and was president of Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company. John Allison (ed.), *Notable Men of Tennessee* (Atlanta, 1905), I, 102; Joshua W. Caldwell, *Sketches of the Bench and Bar of Tennessee* (Knoxville, 1898), 292. Governor James D. Porter, who succeeded Governor Brown, became president of the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad after his two terms in office. Allison, *op. cit.*, II, 87. The leader of the industrialists, Colonel A. S. Colyar, was a former Whig. John Trotwood Moore and Austin P. Foster, *Tennessee, the Volunteer State,* (Chicago, 1923), 102-103. A. H. Arnet, *The Populist Movement in Georgia* (Columbia University *Studies,* New York, 1922, CIV, No. 1), has a valuable discussion of the influence exerted in Georgia politics by the industrialists. He designates them as "Bourbons" which gives a new meaning to that term and one not found in Tennessee.

[10] A tabulation of manuscript election returns, in the secretary of state's office at Nashville, reveals that counties which voted against secession in June, 1861, have remained consistently Republican while those which voted for secession have remained Democratic. There have been exceptions to this rule, however, when serious divisions have occurred within either party. This has been particularly true with respect to the Democrats.

[11] *Nashville Banner,* Jan. 20. 1886. See also *Memphis Avalanche,* Jan. 10, 1886.

From the return of the Democrats to power in 1870 until its final settlement in 1883, the state debt had been an overshadowing issue in Tennessee politics. Despite the urgings of Governors Brown, Porter, and Marks, the Democratic legislatures were unable to reach a satisfactory solution of the problem. As a rule, the Republicans favored full settlement of the debt, but the Democrats were badly divided on the issue. The "Mugwumps", like the Republicans, favored a complete settlement. Other Democrats advocated a reduction of that portion of the debt incurred during the Brownlow administration, while the result of a popular referendum on the subject "was understood to have been an expression of popular sentiment in favor of total repudiation."[12] By 1880, Democratic differences on the subject had become so pronounced that the party divided and the two factions each nominated a candidate for governor. As a result, the Republican candidate, Alvin S. Hawkins, was elected. In 1882 the Democrats adopted a compromise platform and nominated the popular General William B. Bate. Although the extreme state credit wing, "Sky Blues", refused to accept the compromise and nominated a candidate of its own, Bate was elected by a plurality of 27,454. The debt issue was settled in 1883, but so great was the dissatisfaction that in 1884, the year of Cleveland's victory, Bate led his Republican opponent by only 6,925 votes while the Republican candidate for Railroad Commissioner won by 8,602.[13]

The Democrats had also been divided on the subject of railroad regulation. A legislative act in 1883, establishing a railroad commission and providing for more effective control over the carriers, had aroused such effective protest that it was repealed in 1885. While this action tended to mollify the industrialist faction of the Democracy, it was not satisfactory to those elements in the party which had forced the act of 1883.

The Democratic party in Tennessee faced a critical situation as the campaign year of 1886 opened. The long feud between the Harris and Colyar factions showed few signs of abatement, while the rural Democracy, without a spokesman since Andrew Johnson's death, had manifested an apathy which told disastrously at the ballot box. Resentments over the state debt settlement and railroad legislation had not disappeared. Under such circumstances, the party faced likely defeat unless factional discord and rivalries could be submerged and a leader be found who could arouse indifferent voters. Robert L. Taylor, then outstanding among the younger men of the

[12] *Annual Cyclopaedia* (New York, 1861-1901), 1879, p. 827. For a concise and reliable account of the state debt fight in Tennessee from year to year, see the *Annual Cyclopaedia* for the years 1871 to 1883 inclusive.

[13] MS. election returns in office of secretary of state, Nashville.

party, stated the true condition of affairs in these words: ". . . Our party needs reorganization. We have broken into fragments or rather factions, discordant, belligerent, and the party has been rent with feuds which have threatened its overthrow throughout the state. . . . "[14] Republicans also understood the plight of the Democrats and prepared for an aggressive effort to capture the state while its press sounded a note of confidence.[15]

In the face of impending defeat, Democrats who were more concerned with party than with factional success started a movement for harmony which soon met with wide approval.[16] Factional leaders did not dare ignore so formidable a demand and one of the first steps toward a truce occurred on January 9 when control of the *Nashville American,* a leading organ of the Harris wing, was transferred from the uncompromising John J. Vertrees to Colonel Duncan B. Cooper. From that time the *American,* still spokesman of the Harris group, and the *Nashville Union,* Colonel Colyar's own paper, rested from their editorial war upon each other.

The time was most opportune for a factional truce, so far as state issues were concerned. There was a disposition to regard the state debt question as settled in spite of lingering discontent. As far as the railroad issue was concerned, one editor expressed the attitude of those favoring regulation when he declared that "practical statesmanship" did not demand that the state's power over roads always be demonstrated.[17] Other state issues there were, but at that time they were ill-defined and did not press for solution. Prohibition was a live issue, but it was submitted to a vote of the people and was thereby removed from party politics.[18] Tennessee was com-

[14] Letter of Robert L. Taylor to unnamed friends, published in the *Nashville Banner,* Jan. 11, 1886.

[15] *Chattanooga Commercial; National Review* (Nashville), *Athens Athenian, Tennessee Tomahawk,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Feb. 8, 28, March 4, 1886; *Philadelphia* (Pa.) *Press,* quoted in *Nashville Union,* Jan. 28 1886.

[16] *Nashville American,* Jan. 24, 1886; *Nashville Union,* Jan. 5, 12, 13, 19, 20, 24, 1886; *Memphis Avalanche,* Feb. 22, 26, 1886; *Johnson City Comet,* early months of 1886. See also *Carghage Mirror-Banner, Carghage Record, Dresden Enterprise, Jackson Tribune-Sun, Lebanon Register, Columbia Herald, Martin Mail, Cannon Courier, Manchester Home Journal, Shelbyville Gazette, Clarksville Chronicle, Smith County Record,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Feb. 8, 10, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, March 3, 9, 1886; Trenton *Tri-weekly Herald, Dayton Advance Gazette, Maury Democrat,* quoted in *Nashville Union,* Jan. 20, 1886, *Athens Post, Monroe Democrat,* quoted in *Nashville American,* Feb. 6, 1886.

[17] *Memphis Avalanche,* Feb. 11, 1886.

[18] While the larger Democratic dailies such as the *Nashville Union, Nashville American,* and *Memphis Avalanche* had little to say about prohibition, its importance was indicated by numerous articles and editorials appearing in the independent *Nashville Banner* as well as in such papers as *Manchester Times, Hartsville Sentinel, Winchester Home Journal, McMinnville New Era, Murfreesboro Free Press, Lebanon Herald, Tullahoma Guardian, Southern Standard, Martin Mail, Winchester News, Dresden Enterprise, Clarksville Tobacco Leaf,* quoted or referred to in *Nashville Banner,* Jan. 19, Feb. 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 24, March 1, 2, 3, 10, 24, 27, 1886.

paratively unaffected by the labor troubles which plagued industrial areas of the country at that time and the question did not disturb politicians. There had been some agitation for a reform of the prison lease system but it had not gained sufficient headway to be a serious issue. In fact, Tennessee was in a transitional period such as exactly suited the harmony plans of the Democrats, and the state platform, later adopted, reflected this significant fact.[19]

Although compromise was easily effected between the factions, so far as state problems were concerned, there were two national issues which came near wrecking the harmony program. These were the tariff and the Blair educational bill. Division on these two subjects among Tennessee Democrats was sharp and reflected the situation that existed in the national Democracy.

The tariff was a bone of contention between different schools of Democratic thought at Washington during the middle Eighties. In 1884 Representative William R. Morrison of Illinois had introduced into the Democratic controlled lower house of Congress his bill for tariff reduction, only to have it defeated by a combination of Republicans and protectionist Democrats, the latter led by Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania.[20] So powerful was the Randall following in the party that the national Democratic convention of 1884 "straddled" the issue by promising to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests, including American labor and American industries whose successful continuance depended upon

---

[19] *Memphis Avalanche,* Feb. 26, 1886, gave an excellent description of the situation. Among other things it said:

"We are, in Tennessee, in the midst of a period of plastic politics where some old things have been settled, where some new things are just rising into prominence and where some steps toward settlement have been taken as to some issues, which themselves but lead to new steps.

"The state debt issue, out of which grew most of the heart-burnings and discords, belongs to the past.

"The railroad issue had been once the subject of angry disputes, ending in an appeal to the courts and in a judicial decision and the repeal of the commission law.

"The convict labor question and kindred labor issues are just in the formulation stage. These can form no part in this year's contention between parties or factions of parties, except as abstractions. The temperance issue, both parties avoid and the temperance men themselves declare it out of the pale of party contention.

"The political conditions in Tennessee are chaotic and formulative and call for harmonious discussion and reasoning together and not for that factional strife which is sometimes very wholesome. The prevailing harmony, of which the *Banner* complains, precisely fits the state of politics, and those are wise who see this and adapt themselves to it."

[20] F. W. Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States* (5th ed., New York, 1903), 253-254.

protection.[21] Although the plank, as one Tennessee editor aptly said, meant "both tweedledum and tweedledee, either or neither, according to the predilections of any faction or voter in the party",[22] the usually positive Grover Cleveland stood squarely upon it in his first inaugural address and message to Congress.[23] Not only did Cleveland take an indefinite stand in his message but he failed to give the Morrison bill any support when it was again before Congress in 1886.[24]

Probably nowhere did Democrats differ more sharply on the tariff than in Tennessee. The Colyar faction, composed as it was of old-line Whigs and industrialists, naturally favored protection and denounced the "fossilized ideas" of those "ante-bellum, free-trade doctrinaires" who were against anything favored by the "Yankees".[25] On the other hand, the Harris or state rights wing denounced protectionist Democrats as Republicans in disguise and demanded that the party be rid of heresies on this subject.[26] When the state convention met, the only tariff plank possible, in view of the harmony movement, was a "straddle" after the fashion of the national platform and was, as one disgusted editor declared, "a sort of Miss Nancy document that was meant to mean nothing."[27]

Division on the Blair educational bill in Tennessee was along the same lines as that on the tariff, with the Colyar group supporting and the Harris followers opposing it. Indeed, the Blair bill was closely identified with the tariff issue. It had been introduced in the United States Senate in 1883 by Senator Blair of New Hampshire, one of the Republican leaders. Ostensibly its purpose was federal aid to education by distribution of certain sums to the states, of which the South would receive the lion's share. As a matter of fact, it was put forward by Republican protectionists with the view of spending an embarrassing surplus, then in the national treasury, which furnished effective arguments to advocates of tariff reduction. The Blair bill was, in truth, a sort of monetary concession to the South in return for which that section might regard the protective tariff with less disfavor. The bill carried with it certain provisions for federal supervision over state educational systems

[21] Kirk H. Porter, (comp.), *National Party Platforms* (New York, 1924), 119.
[22] *Nashville Banner,* Sept. 21, 1886.
[23] James D. Richardson, (comp.), *A Compliation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington, 1896-1899), VIII, 302, 341.
[24] Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer *A History of the United States Since the Civil War* (New York, 1927-1931), IV, 379.
[25] *Nashville Union,* July 14, 1886.
[26] See *Nashville American* and *Memphis Appeal* for the early part of 1886.
[27] *Clarksville Democrat,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Aug. 20, 1886.

which alarmed the friends of state rights.[28] Here again the state convention followed the example of the national Democratic convention of 1884 and adopted a plank that was vague and subject to varied interpretation. On it, both "Bourbon" and "Mugwump" could stand and, by stressing different words, maintain their Simon-pure Democracy.[29] The Blair bill and the tariff presented the most formidable obstacles to Democratic compromise and were the chief issues between "Bob" and "Alf" in the campaign that followed.

Though Democratic factions in Tennessee reached a working agreement on issues, both state and national, they still faced the problem of selecting a gubernatorial candidate. Here it was that the calculations of seasoned politicians were to be upset, for there entered into the contest two powerful forces and one youthful leader, the combination of which was disastrous to well laid plans. Yet this combination was to unite the Democracy and, incidentally, bring about the War of the Roses. One force was the rural Democracy of the state which, lacking spokesmen in party councils, had taken little part in the early understandings of the year. The other force was that of the young men's movement which had grown up in Tennessee, as in other states, as a reaction against an over-long domination of Civil War heroes. The youthful leader, Robert L. Taylor, became the idol of both rural and young Democrats and commanded their enthusiastic support in the contest for nomination as well as for election.

Taylor was well fitted by birth, nature, and political experience to lead these two forces in Tennessee politics and, at the same time, conciliate the factionalists sufficiently to prevent a bolt by either group. He sprang from two East Tennessee families which had been prominent in the political, religious, and economic life of that section. His father, Nathaniel G. Taylor, was a Republican who had aligned himself with the conservative wing of that party during Reconstruction. He had been a staunch Unionist, was a former Whig, and had been a member of Congress. "Nat" Taylor had finished his education at Princeton, and though born a Presbyterian, had become a Methodist preacher and farmer as well as a political leader. The grandfather, James P. Taylor, had been the first attorney-general in the first judicial circuit of Tennessee, and the great-grandfath-

[28] For a more complete discussion of the Blair bill, see Dan M. Robison, "Governor Robert L. Taylor and the Blair Educational Bill in Tennessee". *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* Series II, Vol. II, No. 1 (Oct., 1931).

[29] For the national Democratic plank, see Porter, *op. cit.,* 121. The state platform may be found in the *Nashville American,* Aug. 12, 1886, as well as in other state dailies of that and following date.

er, General Nathaniel Green Taylor, had served with Andrew Jackson in his various campaigns. On the maternal side, "Bob" Taylor's uncle, Landon C. Haynes, was a prominent Democrat who had espoused the cause of secession and who had been one of Tennessee's two representatives in the Senate of the Confederate States. It was young "Bob's" admiration for this uncle that led him to differ politically with his father and his brother "Alf".[30]

Robert L. Taylor's first political prominence came in 1878 when, at the age of twenty-eight, he defeated Major A. H. Pettibone for Congress and became the Democratic representative of his overwhelmingly Republican district. Two years later, however, Major Pettibone turned the tables and young Taylor's congressional career ended for the time being. In spite of this defeat, Taylor's brilliant victory in 1878, together with the large vote given him in his second canvass, marked him as a coming young man among Tennessee Democrats. In 1881, when a fight between the Harris and Colyar factions in the legislature over the election of a United States Senator had deadlocked that body, young Taylor was among those voted on. On five ballots he received the highest vote of any candidate, but not a majority.[31] In the following year when the Democratic state convention nominated William B. Bate for governor, five ballots were taken before the nomination was made. On each of these, "Bob" Taylor received the second highest vote and on the third, from a vote of slightly over 1300, his total was only thirty-two below that of Bate, the leading candidate.[32] In 1884 he was elector-at-large on the Democratic ticket and canvassed the state for Cleveland. It was this canvass which "secured for him a firm place in the hearts of the young men of the state and won him the admiration of the old".[33] Two years later one editor, in discussing his gubernatorial prospects, declared "the people have been for him since his canvass as elector . . ."[34] In 1885 President Cleveland appointed him pension agent at Knoxville, which office he held until his nomination for governor.

"Bob" Taylor's nature and background fitted him to lead the rural Democracy of the state as well as the younger elements of his party. His father, though he had been defeated for Congress by

[30] For an interesting sketch of family history and of Taylor's early life, see James P., Alf A., and Hugh L. Taylor, *Life and Career of Senator Robert Love Taylor.*

[31] *Senate Journal* (42nd General Assembly of Tennessee, 1881), 175-235. Alfred A. Taylor received a few votes in this contest.

[32] *Nashville American,* June 22, 1882.

[33] *Memphis Avalanche,* Oct. 7, 1886.

[34] *Jackson Tribune-Sun,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Aug. 5, 1886.

Andrew Johnson before the war, became one of Johnson's staunchest supporters during the following Reconstruction. The families were close friends, and it was only natural that the younger Democratic member of the Taylor family should become imbued with Johnson's political philosophy. He learned to think in terms of the "common people" and he naturally spoke a language they understood. His droll humor, his inexhaustible fund of anecdotes, and his ready use of the fiddle for campaign purposes were weapons before which logic and learning were powerless. His speeches in Congress, though few and lacking in brilliance, showed that he knew the interests of the agrarians and would defend them.[35] His family's part on both the Union and Confederate sides during the war, together with the fact that his youth had prevented him from taking an active part in it, enabled him to appeal to the younger men of the state without arousing the prejudices of those who had engaged in the conflict.

Such was the man who now arose in Tennessee politics to confound Democratic factionalists and to succeed Andrew Johnson as the spokesman of the state's rural Democracy.

Possible candidates for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination were numerous in the early months of 1886, but by April the field had narrowed down to Taylor, General George G. Dibrell, Colonel Robert F. Looney, Major Thomas M. McConnell, and Captain Thomas L. Williams.[36] There was a general understanding that the candidate should come from East Tennessee, since both United States senators and all the recently elected members of the Supreme Court came from the other sections of the state. This fact practically eliminated Looney, whose home was in Memphis.

General Dibrell, as the candidate of the Colyar faction, was Taylor's chief rival. In addition to his distinguished record in the Confederate army and his experience as a member of Congress, Dibrell was a director of the Southwestern Railroad and of the Bon Air Company and was thus thoroughly acceptable to the industrialists. Although his home was in Middle Tennessee, his friends held that since the congressional district he had so long represented lay partly in East Tennessee, he thereby could be regarded as being of that section. He was described by his newspaper admirers as a strong, dignified man who would make a desirable candidate and a good safe

[35] *Congressional Record,* IX, 397, 625, 1057 (46th Cong., 1st Sess., 1879); *ibid.,* 1071, 1182 (46th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1879-1880).

[36] Among other names suggested earlier in the year were Captain Albert T. McNeal, General W. C. Whitthorn, Colonel Robert Gates, General J. P. Palmer, Colonel B. A. Enloe, R. P. Frierson, S. A. Champion, Dr. William Morrow, and J. C. Lutrell.

governor. One editor supported him with these words: "What the people want is a Governor of broad mind and broad honesty and they will have it in General Dibrell. If they hanker after spread-eaglism, showy and pompous or theatrical declamation, they will have to look elsewhere."[37] Another commended him because he did not play the fiddle.[38] General Dibrell was known and respected throughout the state, and though his newspaper support came largely from Middle Tennessee, it was not confined to that section.[39]

Major McConnell and Captain Williams were both from East Tennessee and showed no strength outside that area. Their only hope of nomination lay in the possibility that a caucus of East Tennessee delegates might name one or the other and place him before the convention as that section's candidate. This was tried but failed when the Taylor delegates from the eastern counties refused to enter the caucus.

As early as January, friends of Robert L. Taylor had urged him to stand for the nomination, and this he consented to do only on condition he be deemed the best man to unite the party. He let it be known that he would not make a fight against any other candidate.[40] In spite of the fact that none of the larger party papers supported him, and in spite of the fact that he was regarded as an interloper by the older leaders of his party, Taylor's strength became apparent early in the contest. It soon developed into a race of the field against "Bob", and the opposition press of both factions turned its attention to stopping him, though with a noticeable lack of bitterness.

Taylor's fitness for the governorship was questioned by those opposing him. They claimed that party interests demanded a nominee who could carry on a campaign of dignity and moderation, and held that "Bob's" skill with fiddle and joke marked the limits of his ability. One editor admitted that he could make a good "Whoop-em-up" speech, play the fiddle, and "make the boys laugh," but believed that he lacked that "solid matter" which marked a statesman.[41] Along with ridicule, Taylor's opponents spread a de-

[37] *Nashville Banner,* Aug 5, 1886.

[38] *Lebanon Herald,* quoted in *ibid.*

[39] *The Nashville Banner* was one of the outstanding Dibrell papers and was seconded by such rural papers as *Clarksville Tobacco Leaf, Sparta State and Farm, Dresden Enterprise, Bedford County Times, Lebanon Herald, Franklin County News, McMinnville New Era, Tullahoma Guardian, Humbolt Messenger, Henderson True Democrat, Savannah Courier, Sparta Expositor, Brownsville State,* quoted in *Nashville Banner* from Feb. 11 to July 7, 1886.

[40] Taylor's letter, *Nashville Banner,* Jan. 11, 1886.

[41] *Memphis Avalanche,* April 24, 1886; *Pulaski Citizen, Dresden Enterprise,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Feb. 6, March 17, 1886.

featest propaganda up to the very end of the campaign. They held that his strength was greatly exaggerated, that his "boom got washed away in the big rise," that his "fiddle snapped a string," and that "Bob will be left high and dry and his old Tallapoosa will be smashed on the rocks."[42]

When the Republicans nominated Alfred A. Taylor, seven weeks before the Democratic convention was to meet, opponents of "Bob" within his party felt that they had an unanswerable argument against him. A campaign between brothers, the more serious among them declared, would be a "contemptible farce," an "unnatural and disgusting spectacle," and a "repulsive tableau to all who cherish the memories of childhood, home and mother."[43] Others took a lighter view of the possibility and tried to ridicule "Bob" out of the Democratic contest. One editor suggested that the Taylor family hold a caucus to name Tennessee's next governor. Another thought that if "Bob" were not nominated the Taylor family, already "complacently contemplating the governorship," might hold an indignation meeting. Still others believed that justice to the family required that the father be nominated on the Prohibition ticket and a younger brother be named as the Greenback candidate.[44]

In spite of all opposition arguments, "Bob's" boom was not "washed away" but continued to become more formidable as the weeks passed. Through it all, he took no active part in the campaign and it does not appear that he made a single appeal for delegates or committed himself on any issue. He was, as has been stated, pension agent at Knoxville and President Cleveland's civil service rules against federal employees engaging in politics were very strict. So faithfully did Taylor observe these that he refused to attend the convention which nominated him.[45] His active participation was not necessary, however, for throughout the summer, in the rural areas, farmers gathered at the county conventions and instructed delegates for him, regardless of what the politicians had planned. The Madison county convention may be regarded as typical of what was taking place over the state. A report of the convention read: "The result of the convention Saturday was as we predicted. There was a strong sentiment in the county for Taylor, and the county Democracy

---

[42] *Lebanon Herald, Newport Sentinel, Morristown Gazette, Chattanooga Times, Hartsville Sentinel,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* March 22, 24, Apr. 5, 19, July 29, 1886; *Memphis Avalanche,* Apr. 18, 1886.

[43] *Memphis Appeal,* July 14, Aug. 3, 8, 1886.

[44] *Nashville Banner,* July 6, 17, 24, 1886; *Hickman Pioneer,* quoted in *ibid.,* June 6, 1886; *Memphis Appeal,* July 14, 1886.

[45] *Nashville Banner,* Aug. 11, 1886.

were on hand in good numbers. It required no leadership to rouse a strong following for Taylor. The people were for him and had been since his canvass as elector for the State on the Cleveland-Hendricks ticket. There was a respectable minority for Dibrell."[46]

This revolt by the farmers of Tennessee against their old political leaders was not an isolated phenomenon. It was an early manifestation of the agrarian unrest which was soon to sweep the country and to terminate in the Populist movement. The year 1886 saw its appearance not only in Tennessee but in other Southern states. The Tillman movement in South Carolina was getting under way, and "Private" John Allen had defeated ranking officers for congress in Mississippi. Tom Watson of Georgia and Ruben F. Kolb of Alabama were preparing for their long fight against the ruling caste of the Democracy in their respective states.[47] How far the later development of this agrarian movement in Tennessee was influenced by Taylor's rise to leadership at this time, is an interesting question that does not come within the scope of this study.[48]

The young men's movement, like that of the agrarians, was not confined to Tennessee. Everywhere there was a natural reaction against the long sway of Civil War leaders and issues. New questions were arising and the younger generation wished to solve them. In speaking of this movement in Georgia where a number of "old Southern war horses" were having "hard pulls" to retain their seats in congress, a Republican editor at Knoxville rejoiced that "the hold of the brigadier on the Southern heart-string is weakening."[49] Another Republican paper noted the rise of the young Democracy in Tennessee with these words: ". . . the brigadiers, colonels and 'majahs' are no longer ruling factors in Tennessee politics,"[50] and a Memphis editor believed the result of Taylor's victory to mean that "shoulder straps and war memories shall not rule more."[51] Frequent editorial expressions such as, "Tennessee politics are in the hands of the young men," ". . . the people are disposed to be off

[46] *Jackson Tribune-Sun,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Aug. 5, 1886. For numerous newspaper comments on Taylor's strength with the masses in the rural areas, see *Waverly News, Shelbyville Commercial, Milan Exchange, Martin Mail, Lexington Press, Jackson Dispatch,* quoted in *Nashville Banner,* Feb. 8, 15, 27, March 17, July 7, 1886.

[47] Francis B. Simpkins, *The Tillman Movement in South Carolina* (Durham, North Carolina, 1926): Arnet, *op. cit.;* Charles Grayson Summersell, A Life of Ruben F. Kolb (unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Alabama, 1930).

[48] This and other phases of Taylor's part in Tennessee politics are discussed in Daniel Merritt Robison, *Governor Robert L. Taylor and Tennessee Politics,* 1886-1896 (to be published).

[49] *Knoxville Daily Chronicle,* May 26, 1886.

[50] *Knoxville Daily Journal,* Aug. 19, 1886.

[51] *Memphis Avalanche,* Aug. 17, 1886.

with the old", "a shaking up of dry bones," indicated that the young men's movement in Tennessee was a real force to be reckoned with.[52]

There can be no question that Robert L. Taylor was the choice of the rural and youthful Democracy and that his strength lay largely with those elements of his party. A Nashville paper, which had not supported him, testified to this in commenting upon his delegates to the convention. They were, for the most part, younger men, the paper declared, most of whom came from the rural districts. This fact, it stated, showed that Taylor had "some strange and wonderful hold upon that element of the people."[53]

Under the influence of the "strange and wonderful hold," young Democrats from rural Tennessee came to the convention at Nashville with but one purpose in mind—to nominate "Our Bob." They cared little if this act defeated the plans of old political leaders. Others might question their young favorite's ability and ridicule his fiddle, others might be shocked at the thought of two brothers seeking the same high office, others might doubt "Bob's" ability to win the nomination against heavy odds, but not they.

Balloting started with Taylor leading the other candidates, but 285 votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority. He lacked 119 of having a simple majority. The vote stood: Taylor 611½, Dibrell 388½, Looney 203½, and McConnell, who had received the endorsement of the East Tennessee caucus of anti-Taylor delegates, 138½. The only hope of the opposition was to concentrate on one man or else to delay the nomination until the Taylor forces should disintegrate. Old factional rivalries made the former course difficult, and the enthusiastic Taylor followers, far from disintegrating, added to their number with each succeeding ballot. On the fifteenth ballot the Dibrell strength attempted to switch to McConnell, but by that time the latter's East Tennessee supporters had decided to elect Taylor. The factionalists had waited too long to combine.[54]

Three significant facts attach themselves to Robert L. Taylor's nomination in 1886. It marked the beginning of the end of the generals, colonels, and majors as dominating figures in Tennessee politics. Voters had turned from the old leaders and issues to the new. It marked the beginning in Tennessee of that agrarian revolt

---

[52] *Memphis Avalanche*, Aug. 18, Sept. 3, 1886; *Memphis Appeal*, Aug. 13, 1886; *Nashville American*, Aug. 12, 1886; *Knoxville Tribune, Camden Herald*, quoted in *Nashville Banner*, Aug. 27, 1886.

[53] *Nashville American*, Aug. 12, 1886.

[54] Accounts of the convention may be found in various daily papers of the state such as *Nashville Banner, Nashville American, Nashville Union, Memphis Avalanche*, and *Memphis Appeal*, Aug. 11, 12, 13, 14, 1886.

which was to play such an important part in the politics of state and nation for the next decade. Finally, it placed at the head of the state's majority party, torn with discord, rivalries, and dissatisfaction, a man admirably fitted to conciliate factions and arouse enthusiasm among the "common people". His conciliatory methods are illustrated by a telegram which he sent to his friends in the convention, when a deadlock seemed imminent: "Don't let my friends be rash. Don't let my candidacy interfere with good feeling and harmony. Do not hold me on to defeat any other candidate. Tell the boys to be cool and conservative. I do not want the nomination at the cost of bitterness and bad blood".[55] Taylor served the customary two terms as governor and this spirit of conciliation guided him throughout. He turned over to his successor the leadership of a party "compact, enthusiastic, confident, in the best trim for years in point of organization. . . ." [56] But the agrarian revolt had begun in earnest and, during the next six years, hands less skilled at conciliation guided the party again to threatened disruption. In 1896, ten years after the War of the Roses, Tennessee's Democracy was again torn with dissentions and faced defeat. Again rural Democrats took matters in their own hands, and again they called upon Robert L. Taylor to harmonize and lead the party to victory.

So much has been said here concerning the nomination of "Bob" Taylor that it seems a bit unfair to "Alf", whom most people regarded as the more able of the two. However, the latter's selection came without serious contest and, it seems, was a move by the Republicans to prevent his brother's selection by the Democrats. The Democratic harmony program, together with "Bob" Taylor's evident popularity with the masses, tended to lessen Republican optimism. During earlier months of the year, numerous persons were suggested for the Republican nomination but none made a fight for the honor.[57] When the convention met, only the names of Alfred A. Taylor and Colonel D. A. Nunn were placed before it. Taylor was chosen on the first ballot although he had received only slight mention in

[55] *Nashville American,* Aug. 13, 1886, telegram to J. L. Pearcy.
[56] *Chattanooga Times,* Aug. 1, 1892.
[57] *Nashville Banner,* from Jan. 12, to June 11, 1886, in its own columns or in quotations from the state press, mentioned twenty one Republicans for the nomination. Among them were Ex-Governor D. W. C. Senter, John J. Littleton, Colonel T. A. Hamilton, Judge Frank T. Reid, Judge Edward H. East, Frank Beasley, ex-Governor Alvin Hawkins, Judge Arch Hughes, Congressman A. H. Pettibone, Zack Taylor, Captain Warder, General Wilder, H. Clay Evans, William R. Moore, Judge Randolph, Alfred A. Taylor, Colonel D. A. Nunn, and G. N. Tillman.

the press during the preceding months. Though he was well known in East Tennessee Republican circles, he was by no means a state figure. A delegate from Knox county, in placing "Alf's" name before the convention, seems to have expressed the Republican attitude when he said: ". . . .the nomination of Mr. Taylor would mean the retirement of the strongest Democratic candidate—Bob Taylor".[58]

The predictions of those horrified at the thought of a fraternal campaign came to naught, and the War of the Roses has become one of the cherished traditions of Tennessee politics. It is a matter of pride to all Tennesseans that, in time, both brothers held the high office for which they contended in that memorable campaign.

[58] *Nashville Banner,* June 18, 1886. This view is contrary to the impression given by the Taylor brothers in *Life and Career of Senator Robert Love Taylor,* 163-164. From this, it would seem that during the weeks between the Republican and Democratic conventions, "Alf" had done such effective campaigning that the Democrats became alarmed and nominated "Bob."

THE CAMP MEETING IN THE EARLY LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE MID-WEST

By Robert L. Shurter

American historians have long recognized the importance of frontier conditions in shaping the lives and characters of the early settlers. Those of us who are interested in the history of American literature have been more slow to acknowledge the influence that these conditions have had on frontier literature. Yet we are coming to realize more and more the necessity for studying our early frontier literature against the social, economic, and religious life of that period; for literature, especially in times of storm and stress, is an outgrowth of life and cannot be divorced from it. With these facts in mind, it may well be of value to examine some such peculiarly frontier institution as the camp meeting in order to present its history as far as possible in the words of contemporary writers, in order to see how large a part it played in our early literature, and in order to see what was the general attitude of the time toward it.

Professor Ralph L. Rusk has already noted that "nothing was more characteristic of the religious activity of the pioneer community than the camp meetings".[1] Certainly there can be little doubt that this type of religious worship bulked large in the lives and thoughts of mid-western pioneers, catering as it did, according to James Truslow Adams, "both to the settlers' desire for company and to his need for expression in emotional life".[2] The camp meeting was an important event in the life of the early settler in Tennessee, Ohio, or Kentucky; sensational in a crude emotional way, it left a lasting impression on all those who participated in this type of religious worship. Thus it is only natural that the camp meeting is to be found playing a major part in the early literature of the region centering around the Ohio Valley. Indeed, the earliest literary historian of that region has noted that "vivid descriptions of the camp meeting and its impressive scenes are to be found in the writings of the early Western historians, poets, and novelists. The pioneer

[1] R. L. Rusk, *The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier* (New York, 1925), I, 46.

[2] J. T. Adams, *The Epic of America* (Boston, 1931), 127.

'revivals' furnish a theme for a sort of sacred romance or divine comedy".[3] It is the purpose of this paper to give something of the history of the camp meeting, to present some of the best contemporary accounts of it, and to analyze the attitude of early literary men toward it.

The camp meeting was devised in the middle west as the most practical method of worship in a newly settled and sparsely populated country where there were few established churches. It became immensely popular, probably because of the relief it afforded to the frontier settler from a life of drab monotony lacking in any sort of emotional development. As one contemporary historian tells us, "living remote and consigned the greater part of the time to the musing loneliness of their conditions in the forests, or the prairie, when they congregate on these exciting occasions, society itself is to them a novelty and an excitement".[4] These camp meetings were vivid, eventful periods in a rather colorless existence; consequently when men in the early middle west turned to writing, it was but natural that they devoted much of their time to descriptions of these meetings.

The earliest and most spectacular of the camp meetings took place, according to a contemporary account,[5]

> Somewhere between 1800 and 1801, in the upper part of Kentucky, at a memorable place called 'Cane Ridge', where was appointed a sacramental meeting by some of the Presbyterian ministers. At which meeting, seemingly unexpected by ministers or people, the mighty power of God was displayed in a very extraordinary manner; many were moved to tears and bitter and loud crying for mercy. The meeting was protracted for weeks. Ministers of almost all denominations flocked in from far and near. The meeting was kept up by night and day. Thousands heard of the mighty work, and came on foot, on horseback, in carriages and wagons. It was supposed that there were in attendance at times during the meeting from twelve to twenty-five thousand people. Hundreds fell prostrate under the mighty power of God, as men slain in battle. . . It was supposed by eye and ear witnesses that between one and two

[3] W. H. Venable, *Beginnings of Literary Culture in the Ohio Valley* (Cincinnati, 1891), 207.

[4] Timothy Flint, *A Condensed Geography and History of the Western States or the Mississippi Valley* (Cincinnati, 1828), I, 219.

[5] *The Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, the Backwoods Preacher,* edited by W. P. Strickland (New York, 1856), 30.

> thousand souls were happily and powerfully converted to God during the meeting. It was not unusual for one, two, three, and four to seven preachers to be addressing the listening thousands at the same time from the different stands erected for the purpose. . . It was said, by truthful witnesses, that at times more than one thousand persons broke out into loud shouting all at once, and that the shouts could be heard for miles around.

Scenes like this, which were re-enacted hundreds of times in the years following, were nothing if not impressive, and the poets, short story writers, novelists, and biographers of the time made full use of them, sometimes for descriptive material, sometimes as a background for their stories.

Almost all of the early writers speak of the awesome and unforgettable beauty of the camp meeting at night. Characteristic is Micah Flint's poem "The Camp Meeting"[6] in which he describes a night scene at a camp meeting in the Tennessee mountains, remembered possibly from the days of his youth:

> At length the hour of evening worship came;
> And on their rustic seats, fresh-cleft, and hewn
> From the huge poplars, and in many a range
> Of circling rows dispos'd, in quiet sat
> The expectant multitude. O, 'twas a scene!
> The silent thousands that were listening there,
> Midst the gray columns of that ancient wood,
> Its dark green roof, the rows of whitening tents,
> That circled in the distance, and the clear
> And sparkling waters of the mountain stream,
> In torch-light gleaming, as it danc'd along;
> And more than all, the rustling leaves that caught
> On their moist surfaces the light, and wav'd
> On every bough, now in their native green,
> And now in burnished gold.

A similar scene is used by Judge James Hall, the foremost writer of short stories in the middle west at this period, as the setting for his tale, "The Backwoodsman":[7]

> But nothing could exceed the solemn and beautiful effect of the meeting at night. The huts were all illuminated, and

[6] To be found in *The Poets and Poetry of the West,* by W. T. Coggleshall (Columbus, 1860), 59.

[7] James Hall, *Legends of the West* (Philadelphia, 1832), 11.

> lights were fastened to the trees, throwing a glare upon the overhanging canopy of leaves, now beginning to be tinged with the rich hues of autumn, which gave it the appearance of a splendid arch, finely carved and exquisitely shaded. All around was the dark gloom of the forest, deepened to intense blackness by its contrast with the brilliant light of the camp.

Unfortunately, some of the manifestations of the camp meetings were less beautiful. Almost all the witnesses speak of the tumultuous praying, shouting, shrieking, groaning, and the loud singing, which formed the chief part of the atmosphere of these meetings. James Flint describes the camp meeting as being "like a menagerie of wild beasts".[8] From other accounts of these early writers, it is certain that the people were worked up to an emotional frenzy which led them to exhibit pathological symptoms. Almost incredible are some of these accounts; Flint, for example, in speaking of the noise and confusion of a camp meeting, says,[9]

> On advancing a few paces, I discovered that the turmoil was chiefly confined within a small enclosure of about thirty feet square, in front of the orator, and that the ground occupied by the congregation was laid with felled trees for seats. A rail fence divided it into two parts, one for females and the other for males. . . The enclosure already mentioned was for the reception of those who undergo religious awakenings, and was filled by both sexes, who were exercising violently. Shouting, screaming, clapping of hands, leaping, jerking, falling, and swooning. The preacher could not be heard, great as his exertions were.

There can be no doubt that those in attendance at the camp meetings believed implicitly in divine intervention and miracles. The following account is typical of much of the frontier literature about camp meetings:[10]

> Children were often made the instruments through which the Lord wrought. At one of these powerful displays of Divine Power, a boy about ten years old broke from the stand in time of preaching under very strong impressions, and having mounted a log at some distance and

[8] James Flint, *Letters from America* (Edinburgh, 1822), 231.
[9] *Ibid.*, 231.
[10] *The Autobiography of Rev. James B. Finley, or Pioneer Life in the West,* edited by W. P. Strickland (Cincinnati, 1856), 366.

> raising his voice in a most affecting manner, cried out, "On the last day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink' ". He attracted the main body of the congregation, and, with streaming eyes, he warned the sinners of their danger, denouncing their doom, if they perservered in sin, and strongly expressed his love for the salvation of their souls, and the desire that they would turn to God and live. By this time the press was so great that he was taken up by two men and held above the crowd. He spoke for near an hour in that convincing eloquence that could be inspired only from heaven, and when exhausted, and language failed to describe the feelings of his soul, he raised his handkerchief, and dropping it, cried, "Thus, O Sinner, will you drop into hell unless you forsake your sins and turn to God". At this moment the power of God fell upon the assembly, and sinners fell as men slain in mighty battle, and the cries for mercy seemed as though they would rend the heavens, and the work spread in a manner which human language cannot describe.

Strangest and most unique of all the phenomena attendant on camp meetings were "the jerks"[11]—a strange physical reaction caused by lack of control over the muscles of the body because of too intense emotional excitement. Lorenzo Dow describes the "jerks" as he first witnessed them in Tennessee:[12]

> Here I saw 'the jerks' and some danced; a strange exercise indeed; however, it is involuntary, yet requires the consent of the will; i. e., the people are taking to jerking irresistibly, and if they try to resist it, it worries them much, yet it is attended by no bodily pain, and those who are exercised to dance, which in the pious seems an antidote to the jerks; if they resist, it brings deadness and barrenness over the mind; but when they yield to it, they feel happy, although it is a great cross. . . Their eyes when dancing seemed to be fixed upwards as if upon an invisible object and they lost to all below.

Another observer tells us of[13]

---

[11] For a psychological explanation of "the Jerks", see C. C. Cleveland, *The Great Revival in the West* (Chicago, 1916).

[12] L. Dow, *The History of a Cosmopolite or Lorenzo Dow's Journal* (Fourth edition, Washington, Ohio, 1848), 215.

[13] *The Autobiography of Rev. James B. Finley*, 365.

> A certain Dr. P. and a lady from Lexington who having heard much of the involuntary jerkings and fallings which attended the exercises, entered into an agreement between themselves that, should either of them be thus strangely attacked or fall, the other was to stand by to the last. It was not long until the lady was brought down in all her pride, a poor sinner in the dust before her God. The Doctor, agitated, came up and felt for her pulse; but alas! her pulse was gone. At this he turned pale, and, staggering a few paces, he fell beneath the power of the same invisible hand. After remaining for some time in this state, they both obtained peace and went home rejoicing. They both lived and died happy Christians. Thousands were affected in the same way.

These phenomena of falling unconscious and of jerking must have soon become commonplace, for another witness says, "I have seen more than a hundred sinners fall like dead men. . . . I have seen more than five hundred persons jerking at one time in my large congregations".[14] Interesting and characteristic is the contemporary judgment of the cause of these phenomena:[15]

> I always looked upon the jerks as a judgment sent from God, first to bring sinners to repentance; and secondly, to show professors that God could work with or without means, and over and above means, and do whatever seemeth him good, to the glory of his grace and the salvation of the world.

Unfortunately for the universal application of this pious explanation, the preachers themselves were sometimes afflicted, as we may learn from the following account by the Rev. Jacob Young:[16]

> In 1804 I first witnessed the strange exercise—the jerks; although I had heard much about it a few months previous. . . . A Rev. Mr. Doke, a Presbyterian clergyman of good standing, having charge of a congregation in the neighborhood of Jonesboro, was the first man of eminence in this region that came under its influence. It alarmed his family and congregation. The affection [*sic*] would often seize him in the pulpit, with so much severity, that a spectator might fear it would break his neck and dislocate his

[14] *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*, 48.
[15] *Ibid.*, 51.
[16] Jacob Young, *The Autobiography of a Pioneer* (Cincinnati, 1857), 135.

> joints. He would laugh immoderately, stand and halloo at the top of his voice, finally leap from the pulpit and run to the woods, screaming like a crazy man. When the exercise was over, he would return to the Church as rational and calm as ever.

The accounts which I have quoted are typical of almost all of the early literature dealing with camp meetings. Hundreds of similar descriptions may be found in the stories, poems, and biographies of the writers of Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. This abundance of literature dealing with the camp meeting is explained, as I have suggested and as the descriptions themselves show, by the awesome beauty and the sensational nature of the events of these revivals.

The attitude of the writers toward the camp meeting is less easy to explain, for almost without exception, every writer who mentions the camp meeting praises it. This is partly explained, of course, by the fact that many of the writers were clergymen and approved of the camp meeting as a practical means of worship. Yet, rather curious it is that none of the writers were willing to admit that the camp meeting had only temporary results at best; that those "converted" remained so only a short time; and that in many cases vice, sexual immorality, and emotional hysteria were to be found at these meetings.

The formula of defence offered for the camp meeting is practically the same in all instances. The fact that the Bible contains accounts of meetings at which Christ preached in the open air, is always mentioned; the camp meeting is the survival of these early meetings. Typical of this type of argument for the camp meeting is the following:[17]

> Look at the example of our blessed Saviour. He might have preached every Sabbath in the Jewish synagogue, if he had chosen; but he did not. . . . At times we find him in the wilderness, or in the grove; surrounded by many thousands, who had nothing better to sit on than the green grass. Nor did these crowds come out in the morning from their homes, and return the same evening; but they continued together day after day, to hear the Saviour's words.

Then it was always pointed out, as in the following account, that God's temples were in the forest and the fields; consequently, those

[17] James Gallaher, *The Western Sketchbook* (Boston, 1850), 361.

were the places where man could best worship:[18]

> They could feel, if they did not see it artistically, that they were in the house of God and at the gate of Heaven. No Michael Angelo had planned the temple where they knelt, and none of the great masters had adorned it with the glories of their art. But God himself had builded it, and His hand had spread the tints that glowed upon it and all around it. In the simplicity of their hearts, they entered it as their Father's house.

Finally, the early writer was certain to point out the fact that the camp meeting converted many profligates and sinners. This last thought runs through all of the literature about the camp meeting. Sinners came to the meetings to ridicule and to scoff, but they fell under the hand of God, and, as Micah Flint says,[19]

> The proud ones, looking down in scorn
> From fancied intellectual heights, whose hearts
> The world had scarr'd; e'en these, unconscious, caught
> Th' infectious weakness, like the rest, and though
> They only "came to mock, remain'd to pray".

Such, then, was the early camp meeting and the rather uncritical attitude of the writer toward it. As an unusual feature of frontier life, it reveals frontier ideas, customs and character in a vivid manner; and since the frontier has played so large a part in shaping American institutions and temperament, we cannot ignore that phase of it revealed by the literature dealing with camp meetings.

---

[18] W. C. Howells, "Camp Meetings in the West Fifty Years Ago", in *Lippincott's Magazine*, X, 213 (August, 1872).

[19] Micah P. Flint, "The Camp Meeting", in *The Poets and Poetry of the West*, edited by W. T. Coggleshall (Columbus, 1860), 62.

WRITINGS ON TENNESSEE HISTORY, 1931-32*

COMPILED BY LAURA E. LUTTRELL

Abernethy, Thomas Perkins. From frontier to plantation in Tennessee. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina press, 1932. 392 p. maps.

Acuff, Judd. The Acuffs, a family history. Knoxville, Typewritten, 1930. 98 p.

ANDERSON. Wilson, S. T. Isaac Anderson, founder and first president of Maryville College. Maryville, Pub. by kindred of Dr. Anderson, 1932. 168 p. ports., pl.

Anderson, Mary F. Jackson's Hermitage—an intimate record of its builder. (in Americana. 1932. v. 26, p. 505-515. plates).

Armstrong, Zella. Tennessee heroes of the revolution. Chattanooga, Lookout publishing co., 1932.

Avery, Myron H. See Mason, Robert Lindsay & Avery, Myron H.

Barthold, Mrs. Oscar. The Knox family. (in The Lookout. July 23, 1932. 2 p. port.)

Blount, William. Letters of Governor William Blount; ed. by Phillip M. Hamer. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 122-137)

Boston, Charles A. Historical background of state of Tennessee and legal education of the coming lawyer. (in Bar assoc. of Tenn. Proceedings. 1931. v. 50, p. 129-150)

Bouldin, Floy Hopkins. A woman of the sixties. (in Confed. vet. 1932, v. 40, p. 293) [Mrs. Sarah N. Sizemore]

Bralliar, Floyd. How we do it at Madison. (in Mountain life & work. 1931. v. 7, p. 26-28) [Nashville agric. normal inst., near Madison]

Brown, Mrs. Rosalie B. Andrew Jackson and the Greasy Cove race track. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Oct. 1931. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 62-66) [This narrative first appeared in Allison, John. Dropped stitches in Tennessee history]

BROWNLOW. Cooper, W. R. Parson Brownlow, a study of reconstruction in Tennessee. (in Southwestern bul. Memphis, Dec. 1931. v. 19, p. 3-14)

——. Queener, V. M. William G. Brownlow as an editor. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 67-82)

Burke, Doris. The Great Smoky Mountains national park. (in Sketch book mag. Nov. 1931. v. 8, p. 18-20. illus.)

Burns, Annie Walker, comp. Record of wills, Hawkins County, Tennessee, 1788-1851. Wallins Creek, Ky., Typewritten, 1932. 62 p.

Burton, James D. Men of the rail in the Tennessee mountains. (in Mountain life and work. Apr. 1932. v. 8, p. 26-27)

Campbell, Thomas Jefferson. The upper Tennessee. Chattanooga, Author, 1932. 144 p. illus., ports.

Carnes, W. W. "Battle above the clouds" a war myth. (in Confed. vet. 1932. v. 40, p. 50-52) [Battle of Lookout Mountain, 1863]

Chambers, W. R. Some reminiscences of an old lawyer. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Oct. 1931. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 67-70)

CHEROKEE INDIANS. Foreman, Grant. Indian removal, the emigration of the five civilized tribes of Indians. Norman, University of Oklahoma press, 1932. 415 p. [Cherokee removal, p. 227-312. ports., plates, map]

Cooper, Murphy Rowe. The Coopers in Tennessee. (in his The Cooper family. Richmond, Garrett & Massie, 1931. p. 91-93)

*A few items published before 1932 and not previously listed are included.

Cooper, Waller Raymond. Parson Brownlow, a study of reconstruction in Tennessee. (in Southwestern bul. Memphis, Dec. 1931. v. 19, p. 3-14)

Crimmins, Nora. Rural library service for Hamilton County, Tennessee. (in Mountain life and work. Apr. 1932. v. 8, p. 28-30)

DOAK FAMILY. French, Mrs. J. P. C. The Doak family of Tennessee. Chattanooga, Lookout pub. co., 1932. (Notable southern families, ed. by Zella Armstrong. v. 6) [First pub. in The Lookout]

Driver, Carl S. John Sevier, pioneer of the Old Southwest. Chapel Hill, S. C., University of North Carolina press, 1932. viii, 240 p. port.

Driver, Leota S. Colonel Richard Sparks—the white Indian. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Jan. 1932. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 96-110)

East Tennessee historical society. Publications. 1932. No. 4.

The Emancipator (complete) Published by Elihu Embree, Jonesborough, Tennessee, 1820. A reprint. Nashville, Tenn., B. H. Murphy, 1932. xi, 112 p.

EMBREE. Evans, M. W. Elihu. Embree, Quaker abolitionist and some of his co-workers. (Friends hist. assoc. Bul. Spring, 1932)

Evans, Matilda W. Elihu Embree, Quaker abolitionist and some of his co-workers. (Friends hist. assoc. Bulletin. Spring, 1932)

Ewing, Frances Howard. The senatorial career of the Hon. Felix Grundy. (in Tenn. hist. mag. 1931-32. Ser. 2, v. 2, p. 3-27; 111-135. port) [to be continued]

Faris, John Thompson. Roaming the eastern mountains. New York, Farrar & Rhinehart, 1932. xvi, 327 p. illus.

Foreman, Grant. Indian removal, the emigration of the five civilized tribes of Indians. Norman, University of Oklahoma press, 1932. 415 p. [Cherokee removal, p. 227-312 p. ports., plates, map]

Foreman, Grant. John Howard Payne and the Cherokee Indians; with text of letter from Payne to J. Watterson. (in Amer. hist. rev. 1932. v. 37, p. 723-730)

Franklin, W. Neil. Virginia and the Cherokee Indian trade, 1673-1752. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932 no. 4, p. 3-21)

French, Mrs. Janie P. C. The Doak family of Tennessee. Chattanooga, Lookout pub. co., 1932. (Notable southern families, ed. by Zella Armstrong. v. 6) [First pub. in The Lookout]

French, Mrs. Marline Ray & Leard, Mrs. Allie Ray. The Rodgers family. Chattanooga, Lookout pub. co., 1932. [Appeared in The Lookout]

Garner, Mary E. The Road builders. (in Mountain life & work. Apr. 1931, v. 7, p. 26-27) [Lost Creek]

Gatlin, Radford. Parentage, birth, nativity and exploits of the immortal hero, James Keelan. Atlanta, Ga., 1862. Knoxville, Stubley printing co., (Reprint, 1932) 13 p. [Keelan defended the railroad bridge at Strawberry Plains in 1861]

GATTINGER. Oakes, H. N. A brief sketch of the life and works of Augustin Gattinger. (in Tenn. acad. of sci. Journal. 1932. v. 7, p. 260-412. port.)

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK. Burke, Doris. The Great Smoky Mountains national park. (in Sketch bk. mag. Nov. 1931. v. 8, p. 18-20. illus.)

———. U. S. Interior department. General information Great Smoky Mountains national park, North Carolina-Tennessee. 1932. 15 p. illus., map.

GRUNDY. Ewing, F. H. The senatorial career of the Hon. Felix Grundy. (in Tenn. hist. mag. 1931-32. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 3-27, 111-135) [to be continued]

Guerry, Moultrie. Men who made Sewanee, for makers of Sewanee today; biographical sketches. Sewanee, Tenn., Univ. press, Univ. of the South, 1932. xv, 102 p. pl.)

Hamer, Mrs. Marguerite B. John Rhea of Tennessee. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 35-44)

Hamer, Philip M., ed. Letters of William Blount. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 122-137)

HARDIN. Patterson, T. C. Joseph Hardin. Mimeographed by B. N. Moore, 1931. 46 p.

Haston, Ernest N., comp. Tennessee blue book and official directory. Jackson, Tenn., Long-Johnson, 1932. 177 p. illus., ports.

HAWKINS COUNTY. Burns, A. W., comp. Hawkins County, Tennessee, wills to 1851. Wallins Creek, Ky., Typewritten, 1932.

Henderson, Archibald. The founding of Nashville, second of the Transylvania towns. Henderson, Ky., Pub. by the Transylvanians, 1932. 15 p. front.

HERMITAGE. Anderson, M. F. Jackson's Hermitage—an intimate record of its builder. (in Americana. 1932. v. 26, p. 502-515. plates)

Hoffmann, Alfred. The mountaineer in industry. (in Mountain life & work. Jan. 1930. v. 5, p. 2-7) [Stony Creek and rayon]

Holbrook, Franklin F., comp. Survey of activities of American agencies in relation to materials for research in the social sciences and the humanities. Comp. for Joint committee on materials for research. Wash. & New York, Pub. by the Cooperating councils, 1932 [Tennessee archives, p. 137-139]

Hesseltine, William Best. Tennessee's invitation to carpet baggers. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 102-115)

Holland, James W. The building of the East Tennessee and Virginia railroad. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 83-101)

Hopwood, Josephus. A journey through the years. An autobiography. St. Louis, Bethany press. 1932. 206 p. ports. [Contains history of Milligan College]

JACKSON. Smyth, Clifford. Andrew Jackson, the man who preserved union and democracy. New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1931. (Builders of America. v. 24)

Jones, Eunice. History of Maury high school from 1806-1931. Dandridge, Tenn., [Printed by Dandridge banner, 1931] 42 p.

KEELING. Gatlin, Radford. Parentage, birth, nativity and exploits of the immortal hero, James Keelan. Atlanta, Ga., 1862. Knoxville, Stubley printing co. (Reprint, 1932) 13 p.

Kirschner, L. L., comp. Memorials in Tennessee supreme court reports, vols. 1-162. (in Tenn. law rev. 1932. v. 10, p. 217-218)

KNOX. Barthold, Mrs. Oscar. The Knox family. (in The Lookout. July 23, 1932. 2 p. port.)

McAdoo, William G. Crowded years. Boston, Houghton, 1931. x, 542 p. illus., ports., map. [Life in Knoxville and Chattanooga, p. 24-54.]

Mason, Robert Lindsay & Avery, Myron H. A bibliography for the great Smokies. (Reprinted from Appalachia. v. 18, 217-277)

Massengill, Samuel Evans. The Massengills, Massengales and variants, 1472-1931. Bristol, Tenn., King printing co., 1931. 909 p. illus., ports.

Men of Tennessee. [Chattanooga, Andrews printing co., 1930] 188 p. ports. [Dedicated to Captain William Rule]

Moore, Powell. The political background of the revolt against Jackson in Tennessee. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 45-66)

NASHVILLE. Henderson, Archibald. The founding of Nashville, second of the Transylvanian towns. Henderson, Ky., Pub. by the Transylvanians, 1932. 15 p. front.

New Bethel Presbyterian church, Sullivan County, Tennessee. The New Bethel sesquicentennial, 1782-1932. Bristol, Tenn., King printing co., 1932. 110 p. ports., illus.

Oakes, Henry N. A brief sketch of the life and works of Augustin Gattinger. (in Tenn. acad. of sci. Journal. 1932. v. 7, p. 260-412. port.)

Ogden, E. Lucy, see Turner, Helen Hamilton & Ogden, E. Lucy, comps.

Parks, Edd Winfield. Dreamer's vision: Frances Wright at Nashoba (1825-30) (in Tenn. hist. mag. Jan. 1932. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 75-86. port.)

Patterson, Tommie Cochran. Joseph Hardin: a biographical and genealogical study. Mimeographed by B. M. Moore, 1931. 46 p.

Patton, James W. The progress of emancipation in Tennessee, 1796-1860. (in Jour. of negro hist. Jan. 1932. v. 17, p. 67-101)

Payne, John Howard. Letter [ed. by Grant Foreman] (in Amer. hist. rev. 1932. v. 37, p. 723-730)

Perkins, Arthur. The Appalachian trail. (in Smoky Mountains hiking club. Annual handbook. 1931. no. 6, p. 54-56)

Pitts, John A. Personal and professional reminiscences of an old lawyer. Kingsport, Tenn., Southern publishers [1930] 381 p. port.

Preston, Thomas W. The Netherland Inn at old Kingsport. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 32-34)

Queener, Verton M. William G. Brownlow as an editor. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 67-82)

RHEA. Hamer, Mrs. M. B. John Rhea of Tennessee. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 35-44)

Richardson, T. C. States that are Dixie's. Tennessee—mother of the Southwest. (in Hollands. 1931 v. 50, p. 20-22, 69. illus.)

Robison, Dan M. Governor Robert L. Taylor and the Blair Educational bill of Tennessee. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Oct. 1931. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 28-49)

RODGERS FAMILY. French, Mrs. M. R. The Rodgers family. Chattanooga, Lookout pub. co., 1932. [Appeared in the Lookout]

Rothrock, Mary U. Books for everybody. (in Mountain life & work. Apr. 1932. v. 8, p. 10-13. illus.) [Knox County library service]

RUGBY. Turner, H. H. Thomas Hughes' American library. (in Wilson bul. Jan. 1932. v. 6, p. 354-355, 357. illus.)

Sanchez, Mrs. Nellie V de G. Stories of the states; tales of early exploration and settlement. Crowell, 1931. 380 p. illus. [A chapter is devoted to Tennessee, giving a brief history, etc.]

SEVIER. Commander Charles Francis Sevier. (in Confed. vet. Mar. 1932. v. 40, p. 104)

Sevier, John. The Executive journal of Governor John Sevier, ed. by Samuel C. Williams. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 138-167)

SEVIER. Driver, C. S. John Sevier, pioneer of the Old Southwest. Chapel Hill, N. C., University of North Carolina press, 1932. viii, 240 p. port.

Shores, Louis. Library service to negroes. (in Wilson bul. Jan. 1931. v. 5, p. 311-315. illus.) [Relates to Fisk University, Nashville; Knoxville and two counties in Tennessee]

SIZEMORE, MRS. SARAH NESBITT. Bouldin, F. H. A woman of the sixties. (in Confed. vet. Aug. 1932. v. 40, p. 293)

Smoky Mountains hiking club. Annual handbook. Knoxville, The club, 1932. no. 7. illus., map.

SPARKS. Driver, L. S. Colonel Richard Sparks—the white Indian. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Jan. 1932. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 96-110)

Swaney, W. B. History of the Bar association of Tennessee. (in Tenn. law rev. Dec. 1931 & Feb. 1932. v. 10, p. 25-41, 114-119) [Accounts taken from Bar assoc. of Tenn. Proceedings, 1924 and 1931]

Tennessee historical magazine. Oct. 1931; Jan. 1932. ser. 2, v. 2, nos. 1-2.

Trabue, Charles C. The new Tennessee code. (in Tenn. law rev. 1932. v. 10, p. 155-164) [Also included in Williams, S. C. History of codification in Tennessee]

Turner, Helen Hamilton & Ogden, E. Lucy, comps. Author and title index to papers, and index to portraits in the Proceedings to the Bar association of Tennessee, sessions, 1-50, 1882-1931. (in Tenn. law rev. 1932. v. 10, p. 193-216)

Turner, Helen Hamilton. Thomas Hughes' American library. (in Wilson bul. Jan. 1932. v. 6, p. 354-355; 357. illus.)

U. S. Department of the interior. General information Great Smoky Mountains national park, North Carolina-Tennessee. 15 p. illus., map.

U. S. Engineer. Tennessee river and tributaries, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama and Kentucky. Wash., Govt print. off., 1930. 2 v. maps, tables. (House doc. 328)

Whitley, Edythe Rucker. Tennessee genealogical records. 1932. v. 1.

Williams, Samuel Cole. Fort Robinson on the Holston. (in East Tenn. hist. soc. Pubs. 1932. no. 4, p. 22-31. pl.)

——. Hazard's proposed colony in the Tennessee country-1755. (in Tenn. hist. mag. Oct. 1931. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 50-61)

——. History of codification in Tennessee. Johnson City, Tenn., Watauga press, 1932. [Reprinted from the Tennessee law review]

——. History of the lost state of Franklin. Revised ed. Washington, D. C., Pioneer pub. co., 1932. 400 p. [1st ed. 1924]

Wilson, Samuel Tyndale. Isaac Anderson, founder and first president of Maryville College. Maryville, Tenn., Pub. by kindred of Dr. Anderson, 1932. 168 p. ports., pl.

WRIGHT. Parks, E. W. Dreamer's vision: Frances Wright of Nashoba (1825-30) (in Tenn. hist. mag. Jan. 1932. ser. 2, v. 2, p. 75-86. port.)

UNPUBLISHED MASTER'S THESES, 1932

George Peabody College for Teachers.

Bailey, Myrtice Maud. Tennessee's attitude toward the Jackson-South Carolina nullification controversy, 1832-1833.

Parman, Katherine. The battle of Nashville.

University of Tennessee.

Bell, Gerald Lee. The regulation of motor transportation in Tennessee.

Cohron, Mary M. A history of state care of the blind and deaf in Tennessee.

Crouch, William Ward. Missionary activities among the Cherokee Indians, 1757-1838.

Garrett, Beatrice L. The confederate government and the unionists of East Tennessee.

Martin, George C., Jr. The effect of physiography on the trade routes of East Tennessee.

Vanderbilt University.

Brooks, Addie Lou. The beginning of railroads in West Tennessee, 1830-1861.

Rawls, Margaret B. Peter Cartwright and his times.

UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS, 1932

Clark, T. D. The development of railroads in the southwestern and adjacent states before 1860. (Duke University)

Folmsbee, Stanley J. State aid to internal improvments in Tennessee, 1836-1861. (University of Pennsylvania)

Moore, Powell. The beginnings of the Whig party in Tennessee. (Indiana University)

Robison, Daniel Merritt. Robert L. Taylor and Tennessee politics, 1886-1896. (Vanderbilt University)

THE EXECUTIVE JOURNAL OF GOVERNOR JOHN SEVIER

EDITED BY SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS

(Continued from THE EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS, No. 1, pp. 95-153; No. 2, pp. 135-149; No. 3, pp. 154-182; and No. 4, pp. 138-167).

Knoxville, 4 July, 1798.

Gentlemen:

General James Robertson of Mero district, James Stuart, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Major Lachlan McIntosh, of Knoxville, who are appointed Agents on the part of the State, will have the honor of delivering you this letter.

Believing you are authorized by the United States to extinguish the claim of the Cherokees, so far as they may be induced to sell, they will have my instructions to faciliate such extinguishment, as far as in their power, and fully to state to you the claims of the people they represent. Permit me to remark, Gentlemen, that this appointment is not made under any apprehension that the Commissioners appointed by the United States will in any manner be inattentive to the rights and interests of the people of Tennessee, but, their remote and unconnected situation with the affairs of this Country, places many very interesting circumstances and events entirely out of their knowledge, a recurrence and development of some facts, through the aid of our Agents, I am led to believe will greatly faciliate your negotiation, and avail the United States of some useful and particular advantages, as also the State, which they have the honor to represent.

Wishing you a happy and successful termination of the charge, with which you are invested.

I have the honor etc

JOHN SEVIER

Alfred Moore, George Walton and John Steele esquires—Commissioners on the part of the United States, for holding a treaty with the Cherokee Indians.

Knoxville, 11th July, 1798.

Sir: Mr. James Colbert,[1] of the Chickasaw Nation, has made known to me some accounts he has against the United States contracted by Chism,[2] when engaged to transact some Indian business. I have recommended to him to Wait on you with his papers, assureing him at the same time you would do him that Justice his claim Merited. Permit me to observe that Mr. James Colbert, together with the rest of the family, and also the principle leaders of the Chickasaw Nation, has discovered great friendship and sincere attachment to the United States. And their conduct in general entitles them to the particular notice and attention of Government especially at the present crisis.

'Colo. Henly[3]

Knoxville, 15th July, 1798.

Sir: This day I am honoured with your of the 29 Ultimo, incloseing the last dispatches from Paris. I am particularly pleased that you conceive it necessary to communicate to the Executive of each State such matters as may be deemed proper to impart, touching the safety and interest of the United States. It will aid them very much in their administrative departments by conveying a knowledge, and certain information, of events and Measures that have & may probably take place—circumstances which may so direct and Govern their Measures as may greatly facilitate the views of the General government, and add Strength and energy throughout the whole Union. Mr. Claiborne is a young politician, tho I con-

[1] The Colbert family was one of the wealthiest and most influential among the Chickasaw for two generations. James Colbert, the elder, was a leader of that nation during the Revolutionary War. His sons were chiefs or outstanding leaders: Gen. William Colbert, Col. George Colbert, Levi Colbert, and James Colbert. The names of four of the family are appended to the Shelby-Jackson treaty with the Chickasaw, Oct. 19, 1818, by which West Tennessee was purchased by the Federal government. For accounts of the Colberts, see Samuel C. Williams, *Beginnings of West Tennessee* (Johnson City, 1930), *passim.*

[2] John Chisholm, of Knoxville, famous for his part in the Blount Conspiracy. Chisholm had been an agent of Governor Blount to the Cherokee and Chickasaw during the period of the Southwest Territory. In July, 1795, Chisholm conducted a delegation of the Chickasaw to the seat of government, Philadelphia; they remained in Knoxville for over a week, and the great chief Piomingo there "committed them to the care of Capt. Chisholm." In November, 1795, Gov. Blount sent Chisholm to the Chickasaw to use his influence to bring peace between that nation and the Creek Indians. Following the admission of Tennessee into the Union, Gov. Sevier used Chisholm as messenger to the Southern tribes. It was in connection with some business of this kind that the account referred to arose. See *Am. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 356.

[3] Col. David Henley, representative of the War Department of the general government in Knoxville.

ceive him well meaning and highly deserving of public confidence, yet he has not had Military experience. I conceived it a duty I owed my country & also my friends, in so alarming a crisis, to give him my ideas and opinion on so very important and interesting an occasion; and, I have reason to believe, that he is now become fully convinced of the propriety of our observation and opinions, with respect to the manner in which our country is to be defended. It is much to be lamented that so many members in Congress would hazard everything to the protection of the Militia, when it is obvious to every person of experiance, that it is utterly impossible to keep up an Army any length of time altogether composed of Militia.

Instances Enough may be reproduced in the course of the late War with Great Brittain, wherein our Militia was by no means to be relied upon, altho it was, and may be again so arranged and disposed of as to do great and very essential services.[4]

In the beginning of the Revolution too many of our legislative bodies, some in order to save expense, trusted to the Militia when in the beginning regulars could have been obtained. The consequence was, the enemy, with little opposition, destroying more wealth by their ravages in a short time, than was sufficient to have supported an Army compleatly able to have checked their progress. Very few instances have occured where Militia have been able to confine a regular Army to any particular or narrow bounds, for the latter have nothing to do but secure themselves, until the former become tired of the service they then of course will disperse. Such disadvantages are almost equally distructive to so many defeats. You rightly observe that it is impossible to change the disposition of a large body of Militia, without an entire confusion. It is also to be remembered that an officer at the head of a regular Army has it much in his power, as well his interest to do so, to compel a body of Militia to change their disposition; and indeed few instances have occured when any Army have been maneouvered out of their chosen disposition but they have suffered in the extreme. The feats performed by the Southern Militia was chiefly done by the frontier post, who had been accustomed to fighting the Indians & from the frequent engagements through necessity became acquainted with a kind of dessipline that had taught them the propriety of forming & supporting lines, and never to suffer themselves to be out-flanked.

[4] The comments of Sevier on the relative merits of regulars and militia are instructive, and his views have the more weight since he always led militia or volunteers in battle.

They are the best of riflemen, and used to hardship and active lives; and, by being engaged frequently with the neighboring Indians in the field, became much more familiar. Wherever those kind of Militia were engaged, the results were seldom unfavorable. For instance the battles fought at King's Mountain, the Cowpen and Guilford, were chiefly of that kind of Militia and altho inferior as to numbers, were compleatly successful in all except the latter. But how different was the scene at Camden Under Gates. His number was as least three to one to that of the enemy, but his militia were of a different kind; all Military operations was unknown to them, and one-half left the field without dischargeing their Guns. Witness Virginia. Could all the boasted strength of that State place a check on Lord Cornwallis until joined by regulars; and his army did not exceed the number of eight thousand. The Gentlemen in opposition, in my opinion, teach a very different lesson. As you have observed, had we an army of fifty thousand well dissciplined troops, to which it would be easy to make additions as needed, it might probably save us from an invasion, (and the money would be chiefly expended among ourselves.)

The commissioners appointed to treat with the Cherokees, lately convened some of the chiefs of the Nation at Tellico. On commenceing the negotiation, it was soon discovered, the Indians were determined not to give up an inch of land; the commissioners on discovering the prominent features things wore, I believe, thought it most adviseable to adjourn, and hold open the treaty until the third day of September. This disappointment has occasioned great alarm and uneasiness among the poor distressed families that have been waiting with great and patient expectation to be permitted to return to their homes and plantations; and, I am sorry to add, it has given great uneasiness through out the State & the friends to Government feel with regret the disappointment while others rejoice and endeavour to cause the people to believe it was a designed diplomatic trick. I have every reason to suppose & think that the Commissioners were perfectly disposed to do all in their power to accomplish the object of their mission, and were so instructed; but being wholy unacquainted with the Indians, and the manner in which negotiations were to be conducted with savage tribes, has much embarrassed the business; and, I believe, if I may be permitted to hazard an opinion, the commissioners greatly dispair of obtaining the object. And I am extremely doubtful myself as to their success alone; but should not, by any means, were there some persons appointed who were acquainted with the Indians and understood the manner in

which they were to be managed. I beg you will pardon me for the remarks I have taken the liberty to make; your knowledge of Indian affairs I hope will readily suggest the propriety of my observations. I am informed that one, if not two, of the commissioners, intend to decline any further attendance at the second meeting. Should it be the case, permit me sir to sollicit your interest to have some person nominated who may be calculated to answer the purpose and for such I beg leave to recommend General James Robertson of this State. His long acquaintance with the Cherokees, together with a full knowledge of the manner in which business is to be transacted, would enable him with the other Gentlemen, in my opinion, to accomplish the object with much more convenience and celerity than may be expected in the present order of things. Was there a proper character or two, to be appointed in this State, the much more likely and shure would be the success and of which I should have little doubt. On the other hand, in case of failure, much less would be the clamour and discontentment of the people.

I flatter myself my observations will readily suggest themselves to you, and assure yourself, sir, that nothing but the critical situation of the business & times have induced me to take the liberty of making such remarks and application. My sincere desire and wishes are that the people may become intirely convinced of the good disposition of the Government towards them, and in no instance can it be done better than by the success of the now pending treaty. James Colbert & his brother, halfbreed Chickasaws, was with me a few days past, and informed that the Spaniards have sent war talks into the Creek and Choctaw Nations in behalf of the French; that the Creek readily received the talks, and also the lower Choctaws. The upper part of the Nation refused until they advised and counciled with the Chickasaws, which being done, their advice was, for the Chocktaws not to concern in the Quarrel, which was agreed to. Colbert informed me that the lower Choctaws had some time ago, in the Spring, prepared to fall on the Natchez Settlements, but had declined the expedition. He also gives it as his opinion that the lower Choctaws & Creeks will inevitably join the French & Spaniards in case of a war between America & those Nations. I have mentioned this information in order that the executive may know whether or not it corresponds with other advices.

Hon'ble Timothy Pickering.

Knoxville, 15 July, 1798.

Dear Sir: The Commissioners met the Cherokees in treaty a few days ago. The result was, the Indians would not relinquish or sell one inch of land; the Commissioners on discovering their disposition, thought best, on consulting with the State Agents, to adjourn the treaty until the third of September.

Had proper persons been appointed, who were acquainted with the Indians, and the manner in which the negotiation should be conducted with those kind of people, there would not have been a shadow of doubt of the success; as it now stands, I have little hopes, unless by the aid of our Agents, and their powers you know are too confined to allow them to enter into the merits of the negotiation fully. I am informed one, if not two, of the Commissioners intended declining any further service on the business. If so I hope it may be in your power to have some new Commissioners appointed; General Robertson would be a very proper person and I think would ensure success. I need not point out to you the deplorable condition of the unhappy people, who have been waiting with patience and sanguine expectation to be permitted to return to their homes and plantations; their case is truly a hard one, and the clamours of all descriptions are loud. The success of the pending treaty is big with important events, and I pray that such measures may be adopted as will once more quiet the minds of the citizens. If the treaty fails the art of man could not convince the people otherways than it has been a designed deplomatic trick. As to my own part, I sincerely believe the Commissioners feel much hurt on the disappointment; that they were perfectly disposed to do every thing in their power to accomplish the objects of their mission, and that they have been so instructed, but many others think very differently. This may be observed, the President by appointing one or two Commissioners in the state would effectually relieve himself from any imputation of being unfriendly, and accomplish the objects contemplated by the treaty if so desired.

James Colbert, and his brother, half breed Chickasaws, inform me that the French and Spaniards have sent to the Creeks and Choctaws to join them, which the former agrees to do, and a large part of the latter.

Honorable Joseph Anderson
and William C. C. Claiborne,
Separately.

Knoxville, 15 July, 1798.

Dear Sir: The first setting out of the treaty has failed, and it is adjourned until the third of September. This has disappointed numbers, and others rejoice. I am informed that one or two of the Commissioners do not mean to attend at the next meeting. If it should be the case, pray my dear friend permit me to solicit your interest to have some person appointed out of this state—two would be better if possible. It would relieve effectually the President from implication in case of failure, and on the other hand be the means of accomplishing the objects contemplated by the treaty if so desired. I have reason to believe the Commissioners used their endeavours to accomplish the objects of their mission, and also feel themselves much hurt at the disappointment; they are Gentlemen wholly unacquainted with the Indians and their manner, in which such business is to be conducted. Therefore little, I fear, is to be expected from either of them alone; permit me to name to you, General James Robertson as a very suitable person to act as one of the commissioners.

Honorable John Steele[5]

Knoxville, 16 July, 1798.

Gentlemen: I have been duly honored with your favor of this day by your Secretary, Captain Smith,[6] wherein you inform me you have compleated, so far as was in your power, the several objects contemplated in that trust confided to you, and that you are ready to state your proceedings.

I lament with you that the issue has not been more favorable; but, at the same time, for the eventual success you are not responsible; and beg leave to say the measures you have persued to forward the attainment were such, in my opinion, as will not deserve censure.

To merrit well of your country I have no doubt was your great ambition; and an earnest investigation of their rights has been your earnest and deligent care, and that you have asserted them in an able and unequivocal manner, I am well aware.

[5] John Steele, of Salisbury, North Carolina, at this time Comptroller of the United States Treasury, to which position he was appointed in 1796, by President Washington. In 1788-89 Steele had served as a commissioner to the Cherokee and Chickasaw, and he was a member of the first and second Congresses of the United States. Sevier evidently thought that Steele had influence with President Adams, a fellow Federalist.

[6] The celebrated John Smith, T., who later figured in a spectacular manner in the history of Tennessee and the West. His home, for quite a time, was at Kingston, Tenn.

I hear with great pleasure of the aid and assistance you have received from Captain Smith, your Secretary, and beg you to assure him so far as may be in my power he shall be amply compensated for the great trouble and services he has rendered.

It is necessary for me Gentlemen to inform, that you will be pleased to hold yourselves in readiness to attend the treaty again when it shall commence, in order to finish the duties of your Agency, unless I shall otherways advise you.

Permit me to offer you, and through you, your Secretary Captain Smith my cordial thanks, for your great care and attention to the rights and interests of the people of Tennessee.

Tomorrow morning 8 o clock will be convenient to receive a statement of your proceedings.

James Robertson, James Stewart,
Lacklin McIntosh, esquires.

Knoxville, 24 July, 1798.

Sir: Yours of the 18th Instant I received to day by the hand of Mr. Tiner, stating a talk given from John Watts, concerning the two Cherokees killed near the mouth of Stone's river. The murders committed on those two Cherokees, I reprobate as highly as any man living, and wish to God the perpetrators of the crime may be brought to condign punishment, and every measure has and will be pursued to have the same effected. Watts has been told by myself that if the aggressors could be convicted, they most assuredly should be punished with death. I also told him that some persons had been apprehended, but no proof sufficient could be obtained to convict them. I am at a loss to understand what is meant by the word satisfaction, unless it means that two persons must be put to death in retaliation for the Indians killed, whether those two were guilty of the murder of not, agreeable to their custom. It ought to be explained to the Indians, and I make no doubt has, that our laws will not punish the innocent, and that no other satisfaction can be given but by the punishment of the actual and real offenders.

I don't wish to recapitulate any former transgressions committed by the Indians, otherways I could easily recite fifty murders that have been committed of recent date, in time of profound peace, and some of them by their principal leaders. I am sincerely disposed to obliterate on my part all enormities that has been committed by the Cherokees, hoping it is the wish of that nation to become entirely friendly and pacific. But, on the other hand, should

the nation authorize any murders to be committed upon any of our good and innocent citizens I shall then take the most ready and early method of bringing them to a sense of their duty.

I am much pleased to hear that Mrs. Williams's child is to be restored to the mother. It has been a long time detained contrary to the engagements in their treaty with the United States, to say nothing about baseness and inhumanity of so cruel an act. I request you will also let them know that I shall also expect they will in a short time return Miss Johnson, taken from this country, that has been so long in captivity, and within so small a distance of her friends, and own father's house; and likewise a number of horses they have lately stolen.

Silas Dinsmore, esquire, Agent to the Cherokees.

Knoxville, 29th August, 1798.

Sir: It has been communicated to me by several respectable characters that were you appointed one of the Judges of the Superior Courts of law and equity, they had reasons to believe you would accept the said appointment.[7]

This information is truly satisfactory to the Executive, and have the pleasure of adding that your acceptance of the office, I have every reason to believe, will give general satisfaction. I now do myself the honor of informing you that in case the office of a Judge of the Superior Court of Law & equity meets your approbation, you will please consider yourself as already appointed. I hope for the pleasure of seeing you at the next Superior Court to be held at this place where I intend myself the honor of presenting you with the Commission. Your answer is requested.

Hon'ble Andrew Jackson, Esq.

Knoxville, 11 September, 1798

The Honorable Daniel Smith, Esqr.,

Sir: The Executive have nominated and appointed Andrew Jackson, esquire, one of the Judges of the Superior Courts of law and equity of the State. If Mr. Jackson accepts of this last appointment, of which I have little doubt, his seat in the Senate of the United States will of course become vacant, and it will remain with the executive of the State, to supply the vacancy by a temporary appointment.

[7] It thus appears that Jackson sought the judgeship as a graceful mode of exit from the United States Senate where he felt that he was a misfit. He had been elected to that body as successor of William Cocke.

I have therefore thought it necessary to advise you that I shall appoint you to supply and fill the place of Mr. Jackson, as Senator for this State in the Senate of the United States. I flatter myself there will be no impediment in the way to prevent your acceptance. Hopeing it may be agreeable to your own situation and domestic arrangements, assureing you, sir, I have every reason to believe your appointment will meet a General approbation of the public, as well of your particular friends.

Danl. Smith, esq.

Knoxville, 16 September, 1798.

Sir: Having lately received information by letter from James Stewart, esquire,[8] that the situation of his health is such as will prevent his attendance at the approaching treaty as one of the Agents, and in consequence thereof he has resigned his appointment.

I have taken the liberty of nominating and appointing you, in his place and stead, hopeing that the same will meet your approbation and acceptance, and that you will please give your attendance at the treaty ground, in conjunction with your colleagues agreeably to my instructions of this day.

General James White.

Knoxville, 16 September, 1798.

Gentlemen: From various reports I am induced to believe that a great number of Cherokees have assembled at Tellico in order to enter into treaty with the Commissioners of the United States, appointed for that purpose. Permit me to request that you will immediately repair to the treaty ground, and attend to such matters and things as materially concern the welfare and interest of this State; particularly to the early relief of the unfortunate people, who have been removed from their plantations, and at the same time keep in view the instructions before given the Agents, on the general and various subjects touching the treaty.

James Robertson, Lachlan McIntosh & James White, esquires,
Agents on the part of the State of Tennessee.

Knoxville, 17 September, 1798.

Sir: It affords me great pleasure to have it in my power to transmit you sundry resolutions entered into by four Companies of Caval-

[8] James Stuart, of Jonesboro, was at the time speaker of the House of Representatives of Tennessee.

ry and mounted infantry belonging to the district of Washington, with an address from Captains Gillespie and Nelson.[9]

You will discover, sir, that they have tendered their services to the President, provided the same should become necessary; and be assured that the officers and privates will do honor both to their country and selves, should they have an opportunity of rendering the same. You may also expect with certainty that four more companies from this state, of the same kind, will be ready to turn out on the shortest notice.

His Excellency John Adams, esquire,
President of the United States.

Knoxville, 18 September, 1798.

Sir: Your favor of the 23rd March with two inclosed copies of letters to Butler and Dinsmore came to hand only on the 15th instant. Had the letter come forward in time, I should have done myself the honor of replying in due season. It is long since well known, that the executive of the State of Tennessee have taken measures to be informed of the intended movements of Zachariah Cox;[10] and could not discover he had any intention of settling at the Muscle Shoals unless permitted by the Government, and it is scarcely possible that Cox could be ignorant enough to hazard such an enterprize on any other principle. I expected it had been sufficient, after announcing to Colonel Butler that Cox, nor his adhearants would be countenanced in making any such settlement, unless permitted by the General Government.

It is a fact that an application was made for permission to pass down the rivers, with Coxe's large boat, (or vessel) notwithstanding I was well convinced they had no intention to make any stand until

[9] Allen Gillespie and Alexander Nelson were the patriots referred to. See letter of January 22, 1799, below.

[10] Cox had been a leader in the formation of the Tennessee Company which purchased from the state of Georgia over three million acres of land in the Great Bend of the Tennessee River, now northern Alabama. This was one of the purchases known as "the first Yazoo sale". President Washington issued a proclamation against settlement of the region. Cox and his associates disregarded it and proceeded to occupy the country, only to be driven off by the Indians. In 1797 Cox revived the scheme, and built a fleet of boats at the mouth of Nolachucky River in which his followers were to descend by water to the district. Cox in this year laid out the town of Elk at or near the mount of Elk River on the north side of the Tennessee, and issued grants for lands and deeds for town lots. Col. Thomas Butler, in command of the United States garrison at Southwest Point, prevented the passage of the flotilla. In August, 1798, Cox turned up at Natchez, Mississippi, where he was arrested on a warrant issued by Gov. Winthrop Sargent, of Mississippi Territory. He escaped and soon afterwards died in New Orleans.

within the state of Kentucky, near the mouth of Cumberland and to a place they were authorized to settle; yet the permission was refused, lest some alarm might be created on the embarkation of the boat.

It is unnecessary for me to say it is impossible any opinion can be harbored that my official conduct would in any measure countenance a thing that would so materially effect and menace the measures of the General Government, who may be assured, I shall at all times be watchful of her interests, honor and safety.[11]

Honorable James McHenry, Secretary of the department of war.

Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives: The occasion of convening you at this time has been to me a subject of much painful reflection, as a more than ordinary accumulation of public expenditure had rendered it desirable to avoid (if practicable) the additional burthens necessarily attendant on an extraordinary session of the Legislature.

Calls important in their nature have arisen during the period of your recess, to which neither the existing laws or Constitution of the State afford an answer, but in Legislative deliberation and by these has it been imposed on me, a duty indispensible by any other means. Among those objects that will require your immediate attention is the Militia law, the inefficiency of which, even for defensive purposes, must afford cause of concern, at a moment when the United States are menaced with foreign aggression, and perhaps it may appear, to make some appropriation calculated to prevent deficiency in arms, as well as to establish depots of ammunition sufficient for effectual defence.

The retouching hand of the Legislature will also be requested on the law regulating the election of a Representative to Congress, as the seat of the present Member becomes vacated in March; and, in case of a called session, the State be unrepresented on the National floor. The change that has taken place in the Senators from this State will likewise claim some share of your attention, as the time of the one will expire with that of the Representative, and the powers of the other, appointed by the Executive, cease with the close of the present session. Much will also be found, of internal arrangement, requiring Legislative aid, as the vacancy occasioned by

[11] Sevier had been connected in a way with the first effort of Cox, and thought it policy to protest his good faith in endeavors to restrain the second attempt.

the resignation of the Speaker of the Senate, who had excepted an appointment under the General Government, admitted of no delay, he being, in case of accident, the sole constitutional organ by which the powers of the Government might be continued in operation, and which if unfilled an Interregnum might ensue.

A recent proceeding of the State of North Carolina, Militating against the Act of Cession, and closing her offices, by which she prevents the Inhabitants of this State from perfecting their Titles, will require deliberation and such interferance as will secure to the fair purchaser, under existing laws, the fruit of his acquirement.

To adopt some system apportioning the State's representation to numbers will be found among your constitutional engagements, and to extend the operations of law to that tract of Country recently acquired, in the treaty with the Cherokees. To this measure I call your attention with much satisfaction finding in the result an opportunity of rendering my gratulations, on the return of our fellow citizens, to their long abandoned homes, and the prospect of future quiet in their possession. During these negotiations, all important to the State, I conceived it proper she should have an ear, and appointed three Gentlemen as Agents on the part of Tennessee to attend the Treaty. The expence of this measure calls for appropriation, and tho relatively small, perhaps an individual instance of moderation, yet will it form no inconsiderable item, in the Catalogue of public expenditure. It is incumbent on me to say the trust has been executed in a way commanding my entire approbation, and I trust you will join me in believing it highly advantageous to the state. The immediate claim to all lands North of the Tennessee river (pretended to belong to the Cherokees for hunting ground) has been so unequivocally and clearly supported, that no party has, or will I presume, undertake to refute, or disavow the same. A statement of their proceedings it is my duty to have laid before you. Coming as you do from various parts of the Government, concentrating in each branch of the Legislature the various wishes and interests of the whole people, local inconveniances, if such exist, cannot fail to be known, and efficient remedies will in your wisdom be suggested; believing it to be the wish of each, as I know it to be the duty of all by every endeavour to advance the growth, better the police, and increase the happiness of our country. To these ends I feel full confidence, your deliberations will be directed.

I now beg leave to make some few remarks in respect to the situation between the United States and that of the French Nation, as

to any information I have been able to obtain I am not induced to believe that the dangers threatening the peace and safety of our County is by any means abated or relaxed.[12] On the contrary, I have my fears that much deception, duplicity and intrigue is carrying on, with intention to divide our good citizens in sentiment, create party discord, and confuse councils; and if carried into effect (which I pray God to avert) will finally blast and put an end to those inestimable blessings of liberty and independance gained and acquired by our past struggles, with the loss of so much of our most valuable and dearest blood.

I therefore pray my fellow citizens that Union may be the basis to guide our conduct, and let our whole and united object be manly and firm opposition to those who may attempt any attack on our Country, our Constitutional rights and privileges.
Knoxville, December 3rd, 1798.

Government House, December 6th, 1798.

Sir: I Hasten to lay before the Representatives the statement of Claim, made by our Agents, and laid before the Commissioners of the United States, shewing the obligations assumed by the General Government to remove those difficulties which has hitherto enbarrassed the rights of the people of this State, arising out of Indian claims.

I conceive it important that the principles it contains should be diffused, and have directed a number of copies sufficient to enable me to furnish to each member of either branch of the Legislature three, and they will, so soon as struck off, be inclosed.
The Honorable James Stewart, Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Honorable William Blount, Speaker of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives.

I do myself the Honor of laying before your Honorable body, sundry resolutions from the State of Massachusetts and Kentucky,

[12] It is interesting to note that Sevier was chosen in this emergency as brigadier general of the United States Provisional Army. Blount to Gen. Robertson, Aug. 8, 1798: "Sevier is appointed by the President as brigadier general of the Provisional Army, and I believe he will accept. Of course Tennessee will have to look out for another Governor. If you ask whether Gen'l. Sevier's services will be required by the United States I can give you no answer; all that is here known upon the subject is that his appointment appears by the newspapers to have taken place on the 19th of July, and I believe it has been conferred upon him unsolicited and unexpected." *Am. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 356. Sevier was one of the four brigadiers appointed for the entire nation at the time. J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the U. S.*, II, 388.

transmitted me from the Executives of those States, requesting the same to be laid before you.

Government House, December 7th, 1798.

Government House, 8 December, 1798.

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

I find it included among my Constitutional duties to "see the laws faithfully executed," and believing that in the assignment of a duty there must, in all cases, be a delegation of commensurate powers, to the performance required.

I should not have hesitated on the complaint of one of your citizens, Shewing an extra Judicial interfereance of Judge Campbell[13] in a case originating in the Inferior Court, to have suspended that Officer from the exercise of those functions attached to his appointment, but the near approach of the period to which the Legislature was called determined me to adopt a more dilatory method, and to submit the facts, for that remedy your deliberations will no doubt apply.

An infraction of your laws has also presented itself in the non-attendance of the Judge at the Spring session of the superior courts of law and equity, in Mero district. And the engagements I have assumed to society imposes on me, the necessary task of rendering the information.

It would be harsh to suppose the possibility of ignorance in the Judge of any part of those duties that are required of me by the Constitution, and therefore I presume had there been cause extenuating the neglect, such cause would have been reported.

To recapitulate the errors of men holding offices of the first responsibility, is certainly among the most painful labors, of appointment. They are duties notwithstanding, where such error is calculated to lessen the respect due the laws, or to disturb the order of the community. Of this class I consider a charge delivered by Judge Campbell at the Spring session of the superior Court in Hamilton District expressive of a desire to see what he termed the encroachments of the General Government on individual right, repressed with arms. The moment was a delicate one, the public sentiment being extremely sore, under the removal of the citizens and required the utmost attention to prevent its discovering itself, in a way every humane mind would deprecate with horror.

[13] Judge David Campbell.

The inclosures furnish the facts, whereon the complaint of one of your citizens is grounded, and should you chose to go further with the investigation, a proper referrence to the names substantiating each charge will be furnished.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

I do myself the honor of laying before your Honorable Body for perusal the instructions given the Agents who attended the late treaty with the Cherokees, also instructions to, and a report from a person employed to visit the Cherokees, previous to the treaty. And further I lay before you the report and proceedings of the Agents during their attendance on the Treaty.[14]

Government House, December 8th, 1798.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

Pursuant to your resolution entered into, at your last session, directing an Agent to be appointed to attend the Georgia Assembly, I nominated and appointed Brigadier General James White, with powers and instructions as by you directed.

I am sorry to add, that the mission had not the desired effect, as you will discover by the enclosed report.

Government House, December 10th, 1798.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

Information in various ways has come forward to the Executive that a number of citizens of the State hath been lately arrested, and is now held in custody under a Military guard, and it is said are to be conveyed to Nashville in order that they may undergo examination before the district Judge.

What these unfortunate men have been guilty of to deserve so much fatigue, trouble and expence (to say nothing of punishment) deserves mature and deliberate enquiry, and is well worthy the at-

[14] A treaty was held with the Cherokee, not in September, but on October 2, 1798, at Tellico in the Cherokee council house. The Tennessee agents were much changed as to personnel. Col. James White, founder of Knoxville, had taken the place of James Stuart; General Robertson did not return in October, and McIntosh had resigned. The business was attended to by White and Gov. Sevier himself. The results were disappointing to the white people of the state; but it contained a cession of lands that enabled nearly all of the dispossessed settlers to return to their former homes and plantations.

tention of the Legislature. I am informed they are charged with the crime of hunting on the lands claimed by the Cherokees, and how just the claim of the Nation may be to the lands laying within our chartered limits. I leave you to judge of, by taking the statement lately made by your Agents who attended the late treaty.

If every poor man, who from mere want and necessity (the first law of Nature) that happens to kill a deer on the land falsely claimed by the Cherokees, and which land is lying in the very center of our state boundary is to be punished by fine, imprisonment etc., unhappy and critical must be the situation of the unfortunate people, who are settled on the verge of the land claimed by those Indians, and not them alone, but the peaceable travelers going into the district of Mero, traveling through the wilderness, who often lose their horses, and are authorized to go around in pursuit of their property, which is often stolen by those Indians, and it is also necessary, for their own safety and protection, at all times to be armed in a country haunted by a set of faithless savages, and further in a wilderness, that affords no subsistance, but the wild game of the woods, and many poor families moving through the same by means of high waters, the badness of the weather, and other unforeseen accidents become destitute and run out of provisions, and are compelled from the very calls of nature and necessity, in order to relieve themselves, the Mother and Infants, to have recourse to hunting in order to procure a subsistance necessary to the preservation of their lives. This last discription, though entirely innocent, may likely be construed to be invaders of Indian territory. Many of the frontier inhabitants in the hour of our greatest distress in the revolutionary war, paid their money to the State of North Carolina, whose right then was not questioned (except by the enemies of America) to the lands now said to belong to this banditti of Indians, and have long since obtained their grants in that legal and solemn form that every other citizen has done through both the States of North Carolina and Tennessee.

I beg leave to call your attention to the premises, and, in behalf of the citizens of the state, request you will in your wisdom, either by remonstrance, or such other mode as you may think proper to adopt, state and lay before the General Government, the evils that highly threaten the quiet of a great number of the citizens of this state; and also, if you should deem it necessary, take measures to prevent the incroachments of the Indians, and prevent their hunting on lands not their own, and perhaps by laying a similar prohibition on their hunters, will in some measures serve to prevent

unpleasant disputes, that will inevitably otherways take place.

It is time for the Government to assert her just rights and claim of domain over the Country included in her chartered limits and make no doubt that the General Government will, if the matter be fairly and justly stated, render ample and compleat redress.

Government House, December 18th, 1798.

Knoxville, January 1st, 1799.

Gentlemen: I do myself the honor of inclosing you two resolves of our Legislature, the purport of which you will on perusal discover. I have therefore to request you will please take the necessary measures conformable to the resolutions.

The Honorable Joseph Anderson, Daniel Smith, and William Charles Cole Claiborne.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

I have been honored with your Address of this day, in which I am informed your session will shortly adjourn without day.

Your approbation of my conduct, at the commencement, and during the present session, together with that since my first appointment to my present situation, is highly flattering to me, and is considered the greatest reward I could possibly receive from the representatives of a free people, in whose behalf I present you my unfeigned thanks for your ready and prompt attention on the present extra session, and for your paternal care and vigilence over the rights, interests, and privileges of your constituants, which you have so ably and fully discovered during the whole course of your deliberations. You have my entire approbation, and sincere acknowledgements. Wishing you Gentlemen happiness in both public and private life.

Government House, January 5th, 1799.

Knoxville, January 8, 1799.

Gentlemen: I do myself the honor of inclosing to you a resolution of our Assembly touching the Alien and Sedition Acts passed by the Congress of the United States. You will therefore please take the measures accordingly.

The Honorable Joseph Anderson,
Daniel Smith & William C. C. Claiborne.

Knoxville, 22 January, 1799.

Sir: I received your letter of the 22 Ultimo, with the two inclosures, viz, two copies of regulations for the Volunteer Companies that may offer their services to the President of the United States. I shall with great pleasure convey the acknowledgements of the President to Allen Gillespie and Alexander Nelson, esquires, and also give them the necessary information respecting the manner in which companies are to be arranged, and under what conditions they will be accepted, which I am very sure will be immediately complied with by the companies.

I readily agree with you that the designs of France is not equivocal, and that she is practising the same insidious arts in America that she has performed in several of the European Countries. It is easy to discover that that Nation is extremely hostile against the Government of our Country, and, in every instance of her conduct, marks of inveteracy may be traced. It is with much pain I discover there still remains a disposition among some of our own citizens to foster and cherish the designs of that hostile, ambitious and dispotic Government; and, sure I am, may I be permitted to suggest the idea that no time ought to be lost in making defensive preparations sufficiently permanent to oppose against the attacks of the insidious Nation. The late visit of a citizen of Pennsylvania to France is sufficiently demonstrative of combinations, and that plots are forming similar to those between Ireland and France. This being the case, of which proofs are daily furnished in abundance, it is easy to conceive what the friends of Government may expect should fate place it in the power of those parties to exercise their malignant and ambitious desires and intentions, which I pray God may avert.

The French Nation have wantonly ravaged and plundered our property and commerce, they have committed daring barbarities on our citizens, and even loaded our Envoys with contempt and egregious insults. Having so done; themselves their Allies and Auxiliaries ought in my opinion to be liable for just and adequate compensation.

The Honorable James McHenry,
Secretary of the Department of War.

Knoxville, March 13th, 1799.

Sir: I am duly honored with yours of the 11th Instant. I have had also the Honor of receiving Governor Sarjent's letter of the 15th January Ultimo. I am creditably informed that Zachariah Cox,

on oath having been first made by Lieutenant William P. Smith, a warrant issued from the Honorable Judge McNairy, on which he was arrested and underwent an examination before the Judge, after which he was bound in cognizance to appear again at a future day. What charges has been exhibited against Cox, I know not particularly, but suppose from information some treasonable offences against the United States. Admitting such to be the case, it would be premature at this time for the Executive of this State, either to order him out of the custody, or prevent the trial before a federal tribunal, whose powers are amply competant for the trying, and punishment of all crimes and misdemeanors that may be alledged to have been committed.

Permit me to inform you sir, that a speedy enquiry will be made respecting the case of Cox; and, provided no lawful impediment appear to be in the way, every compliance and respect will be duly paid Governor Sarjent's request.

Colonel Thomas Butler.

Knoxville, 25 March, 1799.

Sir: An application from Governor Sarjent has been made to the Executive of Tennessee, respecting Zachariah Cox's escape from the Natchez. I have been well informed that Cox was apprehended and examined before your Honor relative to some charges alledged against him; that he was again bound in cognizance to appear at a future day to answer such accusations as might be exhibited against him; the result I have not been fully informed. I now beg leave to request, sir, you will be so obliging as to cause me to be furnished with a transcript of the proceedings that has taken place before your Honor on that occasion, as my conduct in a great measure will be governed thereby.

Honorable Judge McNairy, Judge Jackson and Howell Tatum.

To the Sheriff of Davidson County: Greeting

Whereas the Executive of the Commonwealth of Virginia has forwerded unto me an affidavit duly authenticated, charging a certain John Fallen with Felony; who is a fugitive from the Justice of the Commonwealth aforesaid; and has demanded him, of the Executive of this State, under the Act of Congress entitled "An Act respecting fugitives from Justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters"—

And it is said, that the said John Fallen is confined in the Jail at Nashville, within the limits of your County:—

I do therefore require, and command you to deliver him to Adams Southerlan, who is the Agent appointed by the Executive of Virginia to receive and conduct him to the County where the felony was committed—Given under my hand & seal at Knoxville this 24th day of April 1799.

JOHN SEVIER

By the Governor, Wm. Maclin, Secretary.

Knoxville, Apl. 30th, 1799.

Gentlemen: I have been duly honored with yours of this day, and observe the contents.

I will with pleasure wait on you for the purpose of receiving any communication you may deem proper to make, at my own house, 2 o'clock P. M., this day.

J. Willis, Francis Locke, esquires.

Knoxville, 1st May 1799.

Sir: Yesterday I received a letter from the Executive of the State of North Carolina, requesting me to cause the books and papers of the office kept by you at Nashville to be delivered to General J. Willis, and Francis Locke, esquire, who are appointed to receive and convey the same to that state. I do not conceive myself authorized to order or permit them to be removed from this state, without the approbation and consent of our Legislature, but have consented for General Willis and Mr. Locke to take transcripts of the books and such papers of your office as they may deem necessary to enable the Government of North Carolina to correct such frauds as have been committed in obtaining grants on Military warrants, which I hope, and request you will permit them to do in your office and under your care.

Martin Armstrong, esquire, Nashville.[15]

Knoxville, 24th June, 1799.

Sir: The Revd. Mr. Lyman Potter[16] of the State of Vermont who will have the honor to deliver you this letter, I beg leave to introduce to your notice and attention.

Mr. Potter will communicate to you his business into the Cherokee Nation, and I have no doubt you will afford him every facility

[15] Letters of similar import were addressed to Judge Andrew Jackson and Howell Tatum.

[16] For Potter, see Samuel C. Williams, *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country* (Johnson City, 1928), 455, 458.

the nature and importance of his business may require.
Capt. Edmd. Butler.

To all whom it may concern:

Whereas a certain Coffey, Ballard, and one other person have been lately murdered in Knox County, State aforesaid, and it is supposed that Micajah Harp, and Willie Harp[17] are the perpetrators of the said murders; and whereas it is supposed that the said Micajah Harp and Willie Harp are making towards Stockdon's Valley on the waters of Cumberland river.

Now know ye, that I do authorize Chesley Coffey to take with him six men and immediately persue the said Micajah Harp and Willie Harp, and to take every necessary measure in their power to have the murderers apprehended. And I do enjoin on all officers of the State, both Civil and Military, to render the said Chesley Coffey, and the six other men with him all the necessary aid and assistance to have the perpetrators of the said murderers apprehended and brought back to the aforesaid County of Knox, to be dealt with as directed by law.

Given under my hand and Seal at Knoxville this 29th day of July, 1799.
By the Governor: Wm. Maclin, Secretary.

Knoxville, 24 June, 1799.

Friends and Brothers: The bearer of this letter is the Reverend Mr. Lyman Potter, a person distinguished for his piety, sobriety and moral conduct. His business into your Nation is to enquire of you headmen and warriors whether or not you would wish to engage a suitable person to instruct and teach your young people in the useful branches of education, religion, and the finer arts.

[17] Otto A. Rothert in his *Outlaws of Cave-in-Rock* (Cleveland, 1924), 56-65, gives a full account of the noted outlaws, the Harpes. He states that in 1798 they resided in Knox county, Tennessee, on Beaver Creek, about eight miles west of Knoxville, where under pretense of honest occupation as farmers they gained the confidence of their neighbors and carried on their desperate work as thieves and murderers. Wiley, known as Little Harpe, married Sarah or Sally Rice, a daughter of John Rice, a preacher who lived about four miles north of the Harpe home. This writer states that on July 22, 1799, the two Harpes murdered the young son of Chesley Coffey on Black Oak Ridge, about eight miles northwest of Knoxville, when the boy was out hunting stray cows. See, also, J. W. M. Breazeale, *Life as It Is* (Knoxville, 1842), 126-151, and Draper MSS., 30 S, 306-11.

William Ballard, mentioned by Gov. Sevier, was killed two days later than young Coffey. "It was believed by the neighbors that the Harpes mistook Ballard for Hugh Dunlap, who had been active in endeavoring to arrest them the year before." Rothert, *op. cit.*, 95. Hugh Dunlap was ancestor of a noted family in the history of Tennessee and Texas.

Mr. Potter's designs and intentions appear to be composed of laudable and Christian like virtues; and, should you incline to have your Nation instructed in the useful and necessary branches I have mentioned to you, I beg you to believe you will not find a more suitable person than Mr. Potter either to give instructions himself, or to furnish you with proper characters to do it. I rejoice to see such an offer made by so eminent a character of his services to your people, and hope it may be attended with the utmost success, and blessings to your country.

The Chiefs and Warriors of the Cherokee Nation.

NOTES AND NEWS*

The annual banquet meeting of the East Tennessee Historical Society was held on the evening of January 8, 1932, at the Andrew Johnson Hotel in Knoxville. In fitting recognition of the Washington Bicentennial year, an address on "Washington's Relations to Tennessee and Kentucky" was delivered by Judge Samuel M. Wilson of Lexington, Kentucky. Officers for 1932-33 were elected, as follows: Miss Mary U. Rothrock, president; Mr. V. M. Queener, vice-president; Miss Laura Luttrell, secretary; Mr. Harvey Broome, treasurer; Dr. W. B. Hesseltine, elective member of the executive committee.

The Washington Bicentennial was generally observed throughout Tennessee. Judge John H. DeWitt of Nashville served as chairman of the Tennessee state commission for its observance. On February 22 the Nashville chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy planted a memorial tree on Capitol Hill. Elm trees were planted in a number of cities and towns by the Colonial Dames and other patriotic organizations. In May the National Society of Colonial Dames in Tennessee presented to the state a bronze replica of the famous Houdon bust of Washington which was placed in the capitol in Nashville. To many schools Washington portraits, or busts, were presented. Pageants were given in several places. Of these none surpassed that presented by the Boyd Junior High School of Knoxville. This elaborate pageant was unusual in its portrayal of historic characters in appropriate costumes, in its realistic setting, and in its presentation of historical events.

A marker in honor of Major Nathaniel Evans, a Revolutionary soldier and associate of John Sevier and William Blount, was unveiled at Pleasant Hill Cemetery, near Sparta, May 1, 1932, by Rock House Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution. Nathaniel Evans was captain, in 1793, of the Knox county cavalry and participated in Sevier's Etowah campaign. Later he was advanced to the rank of major of the cavalry of Hamilton District.

*Most of these items have been prepared by Miss Laura Luttrell, secretary of the Society.

The battlefield of Fort Donelson was dedicated on July 4, 1932, as a military park.

The seventieth anniversary of the death of Brigadier General Robert Hatton was celebrated on May 31, 1932, at Lebanon. The exercises took place on the Lebanon Square upon which stands a life-size figure of General Hatton. General Hatton served in the United States Congress, 1859-1861. He entered the Confederate army as colonel of the Seventh Tennessee and, a short time before the Battle of Seven Pines, Virginia, in which he lost his life, he was commissioned brigadier general.

A bronze tablet has been placed upon the Henley Street bridge in Knoxville in honor of Colonel David Henley, Revolutionary soldier and agent of the War Department in the Territory of the United States South of the River Ohio and in the state of Tennessee in the early days. It was unveiled on November 2, 1932, under the auspices of the Bonny Kate Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution. Dean James D. Hoskins of the University of Tennessee delivered the historical address, and descendants of Colonel Henley unveiled the marker. Martial music was furnished by the University band.

Dr. W. B. Hesseltine, professor of history at the University of Chattanooga, is on a leave of absence for the year 1932-33 while serving as an assistant professor of history at the University of Wisconsin.

A pageant, "The Fete of the Founding of Knoxville", was successfully presented in April by the Bonny Kate Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Many pioneer figures were represented by descendants of those pioneers. The part of James White, the founder of Knoxville, was taken by Mr. Cowan Rodgers, a great-great grandson.

The C. M. McClung award for 1932 was won by Dr. W. Neil Franklin for his contribution, "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1673-1752", to the Society's *Publications,* No. 4. The judges were Dr. Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina; Dr. Carl S. Driver, Vanderbilt University; and Professor W. R. Cooper, Southwestern University, Memphis.

The St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, founded at Wartburg by German and Swiss settlers eighty five years ago, had a celebration of its anniversary on September 18, 1932. Rev. Oscar E. Feucht, of Kansas City, Missouri, Rev. H. E. Berger, of Nashville, and Rev. R. E. Malte, of Wartburg, conducted the services which formed the beginning of the festivities.

Stone's River National Military Park, at Murfreesboro, was formally opened and dedicated, in July, 1932, with impressive ceremonies. Major-General B. F. Cheatham, son of Confederate General Cheatham who took part in the battle of Murfreesboro, was the principal speaker. This park contains 325 acres.

A marble shaft to the memory of Jim Tarwater Wright, scout master of the Rockwood organization, and seven boy scouts who were drowned in the flood of March, 1929, was dedicated on Memorial Day. Four hundred people attended the unveiling.

In the cemetery of the First Presbyterian Church, the tomb of General James White, founder of Knoxville, was marked with a bronze plate, June 14, 1932, by James White Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Amanda White McTeer, oldest living descendant, took part in the procession to the grave. Hon. Horace Van Deventer delivered the principal address.

Two Indian war-path markers have been placed: one near Madisonville on Tellico highway, unveiled by Rhea-Craig Chapter, D. A. R.; another in Blount county, on the road to Montvale Springs, unveiled by Mary Blount Chapter, D. A. R.

Two tablets were unveiled at the Polk County High School at Benton, November 22: one to mark old Fort Marr, built by United States soldiers in 1814, was placed by Ocoee Chapter, D. A. R.; the other to honor Nancy Ward, was donated by the Benton Historical Society. Mr. J. A. Higgins, who donated the old Block House, gave an account of the history of the old fort. Mr. John S. Shamblin and Mr. J. D. Clemmer discussed the life and services of Nancy Ward.

A dramatization of Tennessee history was given in a juvenile pageant by Nashville school children in April. It was directed by

Mrs. Inez Bassett Alder and each signal episode in the state's history was portrayed.

P. E. Cox, state archaeologist and archivist, died in Nashville, October 25. He was a former president of the Tennessee Academy of Science and contributed to the *Journal of the Tennessee Academy of Science*: "Pre-historic Man in Tennessee", and "The Cave Man in Tennessee."

DIRECTORY OF CONTRIBUTORS

Judge Samuel M. Wilson is a distinguished member of the bar of Lexington, Kentucky, and a contributor to the publications of the Kentucky State Historical Society and the Filson Club.

W. Neil Franklin, formerly a member of the faculty of Southern Methodist University, is devoting the year, 1932-33, to a study of the Indian trade of South Carolina.

Judge Samuel C. Williams of Johnson City, Tennessee, is a well-known authority on the early history of Tennessee, and a frequent contributor to the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications*.

Paul M. Fink is a banker of Jonesboro, and a prominent member of the Smoky Mountains Hiking Club.

Mrs. Isabel Thompson Kelsay is a writer of New York City.

S. J. Folmsbee is a member of the Department of History of the University of Tennessee.

J. A. Sharp is a teacher of History in the Covington, Tennessee, High School.

Daniel M. Robison is a member of the History faculty of the State Teachers' College, Memphis, Tennessee.

Robert L. Shurter is a member of the English Department of Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio.

Laura E. Luttrell is secretary of the East Tennessee Historical Society.

LIST OF MEMBERS

LIFE MEMBERS

Lt. Col. Fay W. Brabson, Ft. Hamilton, N. Y.
Gen. Charles T. Cates, Knoxville
Mr. E. Y. Chapin, Chattanooga
Miss Virginia Cox, Jonesboro
Mr. Oscar Handley, Knoxville
Mr. J. Fred Johnson, Kingsport
Mrs. J. F. Johnston, Chattanooga
Mrs. C. M. McClung, Knoxville
Mrs. Cyrus Griffin Martin, Chattanooga
Mrs. Thomas Melish, Cincinnati
Mr. Adolph Ochs, New York City
Mrs. W. C. Ross, Knoxville
Hon. Newell Sanders, Chattanooga
Mr. F. A. Stratton, Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Hon. J. A. Susong, Greeneville
Mr. W. W. Woodruff, Knoxville

SUSTAINING MEMBERS

Mr. M. B. Aston, Goldfield, Nev.
Mr. L. M. G. Baker, Knoxville
Mrs. W. P. Bowdry, Ft. Worth, Texas
Mr. J. P. Brown, Chattanooga
Mrs. John H. Cantrell, Chattanooga
Chattanooga Public Library
Mrs. Charles Coffey, Chattanooga
Mr. Adam D. Crouch, Johnson City
Mr. John B. Dennis, Kingsport
Mrs. John B. Dennis, Kingsport
Dr. Carl S. Driver, Nashville
Mr. John W. Green, Knoxville
Dr. Marguerite B. Hamer, Knoxville
Dr. P. M. Hamer, Knoxville
Mr. Hugh B. Hooper, Chattanooga
Judge S. O. Houston, Knoxville
Mrs. J. Fred Johnson, Kingsport
General W. T. Kennerly, Knoxville
Judge Charles W. Lusk, Chattanooga
Dr. S. E. Massengill, Bristol
Mr. George Fort Milton, Chattanooga
Mrs. C. C. Nottingham, Chattanooga
Mr. E. W. Palmer, Kingsport
Miss Mary U. Rothrock, Knoxville
Hon. Sam R. Sells, Johnson City
Col. W. S. Shields, Knoxville
Mrs. Powell Smith, Knoxville
Mr. Joseph P. Summers, Johnson City
Mr. R. C. B. Thruston, Louisville, Ky.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville
Judge S. C. Williams, Johnson City
Judge Samuel M. Wilson, Lexington, Ky.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Dr. T. P. Abernethy, University of Virginia
Mr. J. H. Agee, Knoxville
Mrs. P. J. Allen, Chattanooga
Mr. D. C. Anderson, Steinman, Va.
Mr. J. Osborne Andes, Knoxville
Miss Zella Armstrong, Chattanooga
Mrs. S. M. Arnell, Knoxville
Mr. Samuel E. Asbury, College Station, Tex.
Mr. Mell Atchley, Alcoa
Mrs. W. P. Bailey, Johnson City
Miss Mary E. Baker, Knoxville
Miss Lucy M. Ball, Jacksonville, Ill.
Miss Frances L. Bewley, Johnson City
Miss Mary O. Bible, Jefferson City
Mr. R. O. Biggs, Knoxville
Mrs. A. S. Bowen, Chicamauga, Ga.
Miss Augusta F. Bradford, Chattanooga
Mr. J. E. Brading, Johnson City
Miss Ella Bradley, Laurel, Miss.
Mrs. H. McMillan Briscoe, Knoxville
Mr. D. J. Brittain, Oliver Springs
Mr. Harvey Broome, Knoxville
Mr. John A. Broyles, Jr., Spencer, Tenn.
Mrs. C. C. Burgner, Chattanooga

Mrs. C. B. Burke, Knoxville
Dr. Cawood J. Carmichael, Knoxville
Mrs. Cawood J. Carmichael, Knoxville
Mrs. Clarence L. Carmichael, Knoxville
Dr. Mary S. Carroll, Morristown
Rev. D. W. Carter, Georgetown, Texas
Miss Margaret Cassell, Harriman
Mr. George P. Chandler, Knoxville
Rev. P. L. Cobb, Big Stone Gap, Va.
Miss Mary M. Cohron, Hickory, N. C.
Mr. W. H. Combs, Knoxville
Mr. Charles Comstock, Crossville
Miss Mary Cooke, Copperhill
Mr. John D. Cox, Jonesboro
Mr. John W. Craddock, New Orleans
Mr. John C. Crawford, Maryville
Miss Nora Crimmins, Chattanooga
Mr. J. R. Crittenden, Knoxville
Miss Frances Daniel, Bearden
Mr. John H. Dean, Knoxville
Mrs. John H. Dean, Knoxville
Mrs. Clayton Deming, Knoxville
Mr. Lawrence Derthick, Clarksville
Judge John H. DeWitt, Nashville
Mr. B. E. Dossett, Jacksboro
Mr. Leslie R. Driver, Johnson City
Miss Tommie P. Duffy, Chattanooga
Mr. B. O. Duggan, Knoxville
Mr. Glenn M. Elliott, Johnson City
Mrs. Glenn M. Elliott, Johnson City
Mr. N. B. Eubank, Nashville
Mrs. Joseph K. Evans, Knoxville
Miss Ada Fanz, Knoxville
Miss Miriam Fink, Jonesboro
Mr. Paul M. Fink, Jonesboro
Dr. S. J. Folmsbee, Knoxville
Hon. H. H. Fuson, Harlan, Ky.
Mrs. Frank B. Galyon, Knoxville
Miss Beatrice L. Garrett, Kimberlain Heights
Judge W. B. Garvin, Chattanooga
Prof. C. E. Gatlin, Martin
Mr. Harry Gauding, Maryville
Miss Carolyn Gies, Knoxville
Miss Jean Gillespie, Chattanooga
Miss Meta Goodson, Morristown
Dr. C. O. Gray, Greeneville
Miss Harriet Greve, Knoxville
Miss Penelope Griffiss, Chattanooga
Mrs. Mabel M. Gross, Johnson City
Mr. L. D. Gump, Johnson City
Mrs. L. D. Gump, Johnson City
Miss Sophia Harrill, Knoxville
Mr. John L. Harris, Rome, Ga.
Miss Mary K. Harris, Knoxville
Mrs. S. G. Heiskell, Knoxville
Dr. Archibald Henderson, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Hon. Chas. T. Herndon, Jr., Kingsport
Dr. W. B. Hesseltine, Madison, Wis.
Miss Nannie Lee Hicks, Fountain City
Mr. C. K. Hill, Harriman
Mr. Jack Hillsman, Knoxville
Mr. J. W. Holland, Knoxville
Mrs. Sarah Hood, Knoxville
Mr. Gomer Hoskins, Clinton
Dean James D. Hoskins, Knoxville
Mrs. James D. Hoskins, Knoxville
Miss Elizabeth Hoyt, Montreat, N. C.
Mr. A. C. Hutson, Jr., Fountain City
Mrs. C. R. Hyde, Chattanooga
Mrs. Geo. W. Ivy, Morristown
Mr. J. S. Jacob, Knoxville
Miss Tennessee Jenkins, Jefferson City
Miss Almira Jewell, Maryville
Mrs. D. A. Jewell, Chickamauga, Ga.
Miss Alice H. Johnson, Fountain City
Mrs. J. G. Johnson, Knoxville
Mr. R. P. Keathly, Morrisville, Mo.
Mrs. Pearl W. Kelley, Nashville
Mrs. Isabel T. Kelsay, Staten Island, N. Y.
Miss Anne Kent, Knoxville
Mr. G. J. Kimery, Shelbyville
Dr. Gertrude Lawrence, Milligan College
Miss Edith Belle Layman, Knoxville
Mr. W. B. Leech, Nashville
Mr. J. W. Lillard, Decatur
Miss Laura Luttrell, Knoxville
Mrs. W. E. Luttrell, Knoxville
Miss Alice Lynn, Knoxville
Mrs. Frank McCarty, Knoxville
Miss Maude McConnaughay, Knoxville
Mr. John P. McConnell, East Radford, Va.
Mrs. L. W. McCown, Johnson City
Miss Margaret McFarland, Bristol
Miss Fay McMillan, Knoxville
Mr. H. M. McNeil, Kingsport
Mr. T. W. Marshall, Washington, D. C.
Miss Maxine Mathews, Johnson City
Miss Etta L. Matthews, Tallahassee, Fla.
Mr. L. S. Mayer, Knoxville
Mr. M. B. Measamer, Crossville
Miss Emma Melvin, Knoxville
Mrs. Catherine A. Miller, Morristown
Mrs. Robert R. Miller, Johnson City
Mr. Claude M. Mitchell, Lenoir City
Miss Mabel W. Mitchell, Knoxville
Mr. Walter H. Mohr, George School, Pa.
Mrs. Charles R. Morse, Knoxville
Miss Mary Nelson, Knoxville
Mr. Harry Owen, Clinton
Mr. W. E. Parham, Maryville
Miss Emma Pate, Knoxville
Mr. C. K. Peacock, Chattanooga
Mr. Ludwig Pflanze, Montvale Springs
Mr. H. Arthur Phillips, Washington College
Mr. T. W. Preston, Bristol

Mrs. Brown Prosser, Knoxville
Mr. V. M. Queener, Maryville
Prof. J. T. Rennolds, Murfreesboro
Miss Grace D. Robertson, Knoxville
Mr. W. F. Rogers, Johnson City
Miss Nettie Rollins, Chattanooga
Miss Adelaide Rowell, Chattanooga
Mr. John Sanders, Bristol
Mrs. Herman Schenck, Jr., Knoxville
Miss Rosa Scott, Knoxville
Mr. J. A. Sharp, Sevierville
Mrs. Tom Sherman, Athens
Dr. C. C. Sherrod, Johnson City
Mrs. W. H. Simmons, Springfield
Dr. St. G. L. Sioussat, Philadelphia
Mr. Frank P. Smith, Decatur
Mr. Thomas B. Smith, Knoxville
Mr. H. G. Stuneck, Nashville
Miss Ernestine Taylor, Clinton
Mr. Thomas D. Tinsley, Ashland, Ky.
Mr. W. H. Tipton, Mt. Sterling, Ky.
Mr. Edward T. Triebe, Kingsport
Mr. Horace VanDeventer, Knoxville
Mrs. Horace VanDeventer, Knoxville
Mrs. W. M. Vaught, Elizabethton
Miss Maude Waddell, Knoxville
Mr. Joseph Walker, Fannetsburg, Pa.
Mrs. Charles F. Wayland, Knoxville
Mr. J. J. Weatherly, Asheville, N. C.
Mrs. E O. Wells, Chattanooga
Mr. H. B. Wells, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mr. H. F. Wenning, Chattanooga
Maj. M. V. R. Weyant, Brooklyn
Mr. Robert H. White, Nashville
Miss Dorothy K. Whitlock, Jonesboro
Miss Gladys I. Williams, Knoxville
Mr. George T. Wofford, Johnson City
Mrs. George T. Wofford, Johnson City
Judge J. P. Young, Memphis

SUBSCRIBERS

Alabama, Archives and History Department, Montgomery
American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.
American Historical Society, New York City
Birmingham Public Library
Buffalo Historical Society
Carnegie Library of Nashville
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh
Central High School, Fountain City
Cincinnati Public Library
Cleveland (Ohio) Public Library
Columbia University Library
Connecticut State Library
Cossitt Library, Memphis
Duke University Library
East Tennessee State Teachers' College, Johnson City
Florida State College for Women, Tallassee
Genealogical Society of Utah
Harriman Public Library
Harvard College Library
Judge Xen Hicks, Knoxville
Historical & Philosophical Society of Ohio
Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans
Huntington Library, San Marino, Cal.
Illinois State Historical Library
Indiana State Library
Indiana University
Kentucky State Historical Society
Lawson McGhee Library
Lehigh University Library, Bethlehem, Pa.
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn.
Los Angeles Public Library
Louisiana Historical Society
Maryland Historical Society
Maryville College Library
Massachusetts Historical Society
Mayne Williams Library, Johnson City
Minnesota Historical Society
Missouri State Historical Society
Montgomery County Historical Society, Norristown, Pa.
Morristown Public Library
Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York City
Nebraska Genealogical Society
New England Historical Genealogical Society
New Jersey Society of Pennsylvania
New York Genealogical and Biographical Society
New York Historical Society
New York Public Library
New York State Library
Newberry Library, Chicago
North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Record, Forest City
Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society
Oklahoma Historical Society
Oregon Historical Society
Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
Princeton University Library
Rhode Island Historical Society
St. Louis Mercantile Library Association

St. Louis Public Library
Smith College Library,
Society of California Pioneers
Southern Methodist University
Tennessee College, Murfreesboro
Tennessee Historical Society
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville
Tennessee State Library
Texas State Historical Association
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Chattanooga
University of Chicago Libraries
University of Illinois Library
University of Michigan Library
University of North Carolina Library
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania Library
University of South Carolina Library
University of Tennessee Library
University of Tennessee, Extension Division
University of Tennessee, Junior College, Martin
University of Texas Library
University of Virginia Library
Washington College (Tenn.) Library
Washington University Library, St. Louis
Washington University State Historical Society, Seattle
West Virginia Historical Society
Western Pennsylvania Historical Society
Western Reserve Historical Society
William and Mary College Library
Wisconsin State Historical Society
Yale University Library

NECROLOGY

Mr. John H. Cantrell
Mrs. Jeanette Sterling Greve
Mr. Charles J. McClung
Hon. A. J. Patterson

INDEX

(Items in "Writings on Tennessee History" are not separately indexed)

Abingdon Virginia, railroad convention, 83
Adams, John Quincy, in campaign of 1828, 69-80
Agrarianism in Tennessee, 125-6, 135, 138, 140
Alabama, trade from Tennessee, 82
Allen, Isaac, 61
Alum Cave, 56, 62
Anderson, Addison A., 90
Anderson, Alexander, 100
Anderson, Joseph, letter from Sevier, 160
Armistead, George H., 125n
Armstrong, Martin, 175
Arthur, Gabriel, 57
Asheville, N. C., railroad convention, 87
Athens, Tenn., 95
Atkin, Edmund, 42-43
Atlas, first steam boat in Knoxville, 85
Attakullakulla, 24

Ballard, William, 176
Banking, 93-94, 97, 99, 100
Bartram, William, 58
Bate, William B., 129
Beasley, Frank, 140n
Bell, John, 109
Blair educational bill, 132
Blount College, 18
Bount, William, 4, 18, 156n
Blythe, James, 16
Boone, Daniel, 43
Boonesborough, Kentucky, 8
Broome, Harvey, 178
Brown, John C., 128 n.
Brown, John Mason, 45
Brown, Thomas, 96
Brownlow, James P., 120
Brownlow. John Bell, 118
Brownlow, William G., 105, 107, 112, 117-19, 124
Buckley, S. B., 64, 66
Butler, R. R., 112, 113
Butler, Thomas, 165n.

Cameron, Alexander, 48
Camp meetings, 142-149
Campbell, David, 169
Campbell, William B., 105
Canal, proposed, 82
Carter county, 88
Cate, A. M., 112-14
Cannon, Newton, 90, 91
Champion, S. A., 135n.
Charleston, Tenn., 104
Chattanooga, 95, 98
Cherokee Indians, trade with, 22-38; in French and Indian War, 22-26, 40-43; treaty with Virginia, 24; attack the Wataugans, 47-49; make peace, 50-51; trails, 56; boundary line. 60; treaty negotiations in 1798, 155-170; proposals to educate, 176
Chickasaw Indians, 156, 159
Chicken, George, 57
Chisholm, John, 156
Choctaw Indians, 159
Christian, William, 49
Churchwell, George W., 90
Claiborne, W. C. C., letter from Sevier 160
Clay, George B., 17
Clay, Henry, 69, 74
Clingman, Thomas L., 63
Clingman's Dome, 56, 59, 63, 66
Clinton, 120
Coffey, Chesley, 176
Coffin handbill, 77
Colbert, James, 156, 159
Colonial Dames, Society of, 178
Colyar, A. S., 127, 128 n, 130
Confederacy, United Daughters of, 178
Confederates, disfranchisement of, 105-124
Cooper, Duncan B., 130
Cooper, Joseph A., 108, 109
Cooper, W. R., 179
Coosa River, proposed connection with the Hiwassee, 82
Cox, P. E., 181
Cox, Zachariah, 165, 173-74
Creek Indians, 159
Cuming, Alexander, 57

Daughters of the American Revolution, 178, 179, 180
Davenport, William, 61
DeKalb county, 109

Democratic party in Tennessee, 125-141
DeSoto, 57
DeWitt, John H., 178
Dibrell, George G., 135-6, 138, 139
Dinsmore, Silas, letter from Sevier, 162
Doak, Rev., 147
Doak, Samuel, 7
Doniphan, Joseph, 8
Dow, Lorenzo, 146
Downfall of the Radicals in Tennessee, 105-124
Dragging Canoe, 48, 50
Dresden, 119
Driver, Carl S., 179
Duncan, John, 109
Dunlap, Hugh, 176
Dunlap, R. G., 84
Dyer county, 120

East, Eward H., 140 n
East Tennessee, railroads in, 81-104; trade outlet, 82-83; trade, 98; proposed state of, 101; Unionists in, 105, 106
East Tennessee and Georgia Railroad, 104
East Tennessee and Virginia Railroad, 104
East Tennessee Historical Society, banquet, 178
Education, beginnings of in Kentucky and Tennessee, 7-11
Egwanulti trail, 56
Ekaneetlee gap, 56
Ekaneetlee path, 61
Enloe, B. A., 135 n.
Etheridge, Emerson, 105, 109, 119
Evans, H. Clay, 140 n
Evans, Nathaniel, 178
Explorers in the Great Smokies, 55-68

Fallen, John, 174
Fink, Paul M., contributes "Early Explorers in the Great Smokies", 55-68
Flint, James, 145
Flint, Micah, 144, 149
Folmsbee, S. J., contributes "The Beginnings of the Railroad Movement in East Tennessee", 81-104
Fort Donelson, 179
Fort Loudoun, 25, 44, 57
Fort Marr, 180
Fort Patrick Henry, 50-51
Fort Robinson, 27, 44
Franchise, contest over, 105-124 *passim.*
Franklin, W. Neil, contributes "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1753-1775", 22-38; wins McClung Award, 179
French, relations with the Indians, 159
French and Indian War, Cherokee participation in, 22-26; 40-43
Frierson, R. P., 135 n.
Frontier, literature of, 142-149

Gates, Robert, 135 n
Genet episode, 11-12
Georgia, railroad connection with Tennessee, 88 f
Giles county, 108
Gillespie, Allen, 165, 173
Gist, Benjamin, 54
Gist, Christopher, 5, 39, 42
Gist, Joshua, 54
Gist, Nathaniel, 22, 23, 27, 39-54
Gist, Richard, 39
Gist, Thomas, 39
Gist, William, 54 n
Gray, Barbara, 18
Great Iron Mountains, 58
Great Smoky Mountains, early explorers in, 55-68
Green, Fletcher M., 179
Greeneville College, 18
Gregory Bald, 56
Guest, see Gist
Guyot, Arnold H., 64-68

Hall, James, 144
Hamilton, T. A., 140 n
Harpe, Micajah, 176
Harpe. Willie, 176
Harris, Isham G., 110, 127, 130
Harrodsburg, Kentucky, 8
Hatton, Robert, 179
Hawkins, Alvin S., 129, 140 n
Hawkins line, 60
Hayne, Robert Y., 87, 88, 92, 93-94, 98
Haynes, Landon C., 134
Henley, David, 156, 179
Hesseltine, W. B., 178, 179
Hiwassee River, proposed connection with the Coosa, 82
Hiwassee Railroad, 88 f
Holston Treaty, 18
Hoskins, James D., 179
Houk, L. C., 112
Houston, Sam, 46 n
Huggins Hell, 62-63
Hughes, Arch, 140 n

Indian boundary line, 60
Inman, Henry, 17
Innes, Harry, 4
Iron, in Kentucky, 15
Iron manufacture, 103

Jackson, Andrew, 69-80, 163
Jackson, Tenn., 120
Jacksonian Democracy, 125-6
Jackson, Rachel, 77
Jacobs, Solomon D., 83, 91, 99, 103

Jarnigan, Spencer, 104
Johnson, Andrew, 119, 126
Johnston, James C., 17
Jolly, John, 46 n
Jones, James, C., 101
Jonesboro, 7, 83, 89, 147

Kahn-yah-tah-hee, 46
Kelsay, Isabel Thompson, contributes "The Presidential Campaign of 1828", 69-80
Kentucky, George Washington's relations to, 3-21; beginnings of education in, 7-11; railroad connection with Tennessee, 88 f; camp meetings in, 143
Kephart, Horace, 55, 57
King, Mitchell, 87
Kingsport, 83
Knoxville, 5, 83, 85, 86, 88, 94, 95, 98, 99, 179
Knoxville and Southern Railroad Company, 87
Ku Klux Klan, 106, 108

Land speculations, George Washington and, 13-15
Lanman, Charles, 62
Laurel Top, 61
Lebanon, 179
Lewis, Andrew, 24, 37 n
Lexington, Kentucky, 8
Literature, camp meetings in, 142-149
Littleton, John J., 140 n
Locke, Frances, 175
Lonergan, Kennedy, 92
Long Island of the Holston, 22, 27, 29, 35, 40, 44, 51
Long, Stephen H., 87
Looney, Robert F., 135, 139
Loudon, 88, 120
Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad, 88 f
Love, Robert, 61
Lutrell, J. C., 135 n
Luttrell, Laura E., compiles "Writings on Tennessee History, 1931-32", 150-154; 178
Lynchburgh and New River Railroad, 83-85

McClung Award, 179
McConnell, Thomas M., 135, 136, 139
McGinty, Ann Poague, 8
McIntosh, Lachlan, 155, 162, 164, 170
McKinney, John, 8
McNeal, Albert T., 135 n
McMinn county, 89, 91
Manufacture of iron rails, 103
Map of Overhill Cherokee Country, 57
Maryville, 119, 120
Maynard, Horace, 109
Mebane, James, 61
Meigs Post, 60
Meigs, Return J., 60
Memphis, 98, 107
Middle Tennessee, quarrel with East Tennessee, 101-102; pro-Southern sentiment, 110
Militia, Sevier's views on, 156-58, 166
Mitchell, Elisha, 63
Montvale Springs, 117
Moore, Alfred, 155
Moore, William R., 140 n
Morgan, Charles, 13-14
Morgan, John, 13-14
Morrow, William, 135 n
Murfreesboro, 180

Nashville, 105, 178
Nashville *American*, 130
Nashville *Union*, 130
Needham, James. 57
Negroes, votes of, 105, 106, 107, 118
Nelson, Alexander, 165, 173
Nelson, D. M., 113
Nelson, Thomas A. R., 88, 103, 109
Neville, Presley, 14
Nolichucky settlement, 48
North Carolina, cedes western territory, 4; boundary with Tennessee, 61; railroad connection with Tennessee, 86-89; claims lands in Tennessee, 167, 175
Nunn, D. A., 140

Ohio Valley, camp meetings in, 142-149
Old Abram, 47 n
Old Hop, 22, 40
Overton, James, 19

Palmer, J. P., 135 n
Panic of 1837, 92, 96
Paris, Richard, 22, 24, 38, 40-42
Payne, John Howard, 44
Pearis, see Paris
Pearne, T. H., 107, 112-13
Penitentiary lease system, 131
Perry, Simeon, 61
Pettibone, A. H., 134, 140 n
Philadelphia, Tenn., 88
Pickering, Timothy, letter from Sevier, 156-59
Political Background of Tennessee's War of the Roses, 125-141
Polk, James K., 100, 126
Porter, James D., 128 n
Potter, Lyman, 175, 176
Presidential campaign of 1828, 69-80
Price, Thomas, 40
Prohibition, 130
Pulaski, 106

Queener, V. M., 178

Radicals, downfall in Tennessee, 105-124
Rail-Road Advocate, 81, 85
Railroad regulation, 129
Railroads in East Tennessee, 81-104
Ramsey, J. G. M., 85-86, 97, 100, 102
Reid, Frank T., 140 n
Religion, see camp meetings
Republican party in Tennessee, 105-124, 128-130, 134, 140
Rice, David, 9
Rice, John, 176
Rickets, Robert D., 121
River transportation, 99, 101
Robertson, James, 155, 159, 161, 162, 164, 170
Robison, Daniel M., contributes "The Political Background of Tennessee's War of the Roses", 125-141
Rogers, John B., 109
Rogersville, 81, 83
Ross, David, 29-30
Rothrock, Mary U., 178
Rowles, William, 103
Rutherford's War Trace, 56

Secession in Tennessee, 105-106, 109-110
Senter, DeWitt C., 106 f, 140 n
Sequoyah, 44-46
Sevier, George Washington, 19
Sevier, Henry Clay, 19
Sevier, John, executive journal of, 155-177; messages to the legislature, 166, 168-72; mentioned, 19, 59
Sevier county, 111
Sharp, A. G., 114
Sharp, J. A., contributes "The Downfall of the Radicals in Tennessee", 105-124
Shawnee Indians, 29, 35
Shurter, Robert L., contributes "The Camp Meeting in the Early Life and Literature of the Mid-West", 142-149
Smith, Abraham, 22
Smith, Alexander, 61
Smith, Daniel, 163-64
Smith, William P., 174
Smith T., John, 161
South Carolina, traders in Cherokee country, 23, 24; builds Fort Loudoun on the Little Tennessee, 25; quarrels with Virginia regarding Cherokee, 41; railroad connections with East Tennessee, 85 f
Southeastern Trail, 56
Southerlan, Adams, 175
Southwestern Railroad Bank, 93, 97, 99, 100
Spaniards, relations with Indians, 159
Sparta, 178
State debt, 115, 129
Steamboat navigation of Tennessee River, 85-86, 95
Steele, John, 155, 161
Stokes, Montford, 61
Stokes, William B., 109-124
Stone's River National Military Park, 180
Stuart, Henry, 47-48
Stuart, James, 155, 162, 164, 170
Stuart, John, and Cherokee Indian trade, 28-34

Tahlonteeske, 46
Tariff of 1828, 74
Tariff issue in Tennessee, 131-132
Tassel, the, 46 n, 47 n, 51
Taylor, Alfred A., 125, 137, 140
Taylor, James P., 133
Taylor, Nathaniel G., 133, 134
Taylor, Nathaniel Green, 134
Taylor, Robert L., 133-141
Taylor, Zach, 140 n
Tellico, 164, 170
Temple, O. P., 109
Tennessee, George Washington's relations to, 3-21; beginnings of education in, 7-11; eastern boundary, 59-61; aid to railroads, 81-104 *passim;* banking, 93-100 *passim;* secession and Union sentiment, 105-110; state debt, 115, 129; railroad regulation, 129; reconstruction period, 105-124; campaign of 1869, 105-124; gubernational campaign of 1886, 125-141; Republican party, 105-124; 128-141 *passim;* Democratic party, 125-141; camp meetings in, 142-149; bibliography, 150-154; documents on Sevier's administration, 155-177; celebrates Washington Bicentennial, 178; see East Tennessee, Middle Tennessee.
Tennessee River, trade on, 82, 85, 95
Thomas, W. H., 62
Tillman, G. N., 140 n
Trade, with the Cherokee Indians, 22-38; in East Tennessee, 98
Trails in Great Smokies, 56
Transportation, on East Tennessee rivers, 82, 85, 95; see Railroads
Transylvania University, 7-11, 16
Treaty of Hard Labour, 34
Treaty of the Holston, 60
Treaty of Lochaber, 34
Tuckaleechee trail 56
Turnpikes, 101, 102
Timberlake, Henry, 57

Van Deventer, Horace, 180
Van Dyke, T. Nixon, 104
Vertrees, John J., 130

Virginia, and the Cherokee Indian trade, 22-38; treaty with Cherokee, 24; builds fort on Little Tennessee, 25; seeks Cherokee aid against the French, 40-41; proposed railroad to Tennessee, 83-85

Walker, Thomas, 37 n
Walton, George, 155
War of the Roses in Tennessee, 125-141
Wartburg. 180
Washington, George, relations to Kentucky and Tennessee, 3-21; celebration of Bicentennial in Tennessee, 178
Washington, George A., 16
Washington College, 7-11, 18
Washington county, Kentucky, 7
Washington county, Tennessee, 7
Washington county, Virginia, 6
Washington District, 6, 7, 58
Watauga settlers, attacked by the Cherokee, 47-49
Watts, John, 46, 162
West, George Washington's interest in the, 5-6; camp meetings in, 142-149
Western and Atlantic Railroad, 95, 100
White, James, 164, 170, 180
Whitthorn, W. C., 135 n
Williams, Jarret, 48
Williams, Samuel C., contributes "Nathaniel Gist, Father of Sequoyah", 39-54; edits "The Executive Journal of Governor John Sevier", 155-177
Williams, Thomas L., 135, 136
Willis, J., 175
Wilson, Isaac, 8
Wilson, Samuel M., contributes "Washington's Relations to Kentucky and Tennessee", 3-21
Wright, Jim Tarwater, 180
Writings on Tennessee History, 1931-32, 150-154

Young, Jacob, 147

The C. M. McClung Award

AN award of the sum of Fifty Dollars is offered by Mrs. C. M. McClung, of Knoxville, for each of those papers printed in the Publications of the Society which are adjudged to be the best according to to the conditions governing:

1. Papers contributed by officers of the Society, including the Editorial Board, shall not be deemed to be in competition.

2. Papers must relate to some phase of the history of Tennessee—social, economic, political, constitutional, legal, religious, military or biographical.

3. Originality, scholarship, power of interpretation, clearness of expression, logical arrangement and literary form shall be the tests applied by the judges.

4. Citation of authorities in foot-notes is required.

These awards are in memory of Calvin M. McClung, deceased, founder of a notable collection of Tennessee and Southern history, kept in rooms of the Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville.

The first award was to W. M. Caskey for his "First Administration of Governor Andrew Johnson."

The second award was to W. B. Hesseltine for his "The Underground Railroad from Confederate Prisons to East Tennessee."

The third award was to W. B. Hesseltine for his "Methodism and Reconstruction in East Tennessee."

The fourth award was to W. Neil Franklin for his "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1673-1752."